7

26945

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE
THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* Vogel Dania P.

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* Parent Involvement in E.C.S 'Kindergarten' Programs

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* University of Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M. Ed.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1975

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr. Myer Horowitz

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* July 18/75 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Dania P. Vogel

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE*
15212 - 74 St.
Edmonton, Alberta

NL-91 (3-74)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES 'KINDERGARTEN' PROGRAMS

by

©

DANIA P. VOGEL

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Parent Involvement in Early Childhood Services 'Kindergarten' Programs" submitted by Dania P. Vogel in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Myer Horowitz
Supervisor

Alvin Kay

M. A. Affleck

Date June 25, 1975

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the opinions held by parents concerning their involvement in Early Childhood Services 'kindergarten' programs. These opinions were investigated by a checklist-questionnaire designed to determine the present and desired involvement of parents in the program. In addition, some parents, selected at random, were interviewed.

In general, the findings indicated that of the fifty tasks analyzed, for twenty-five of them, the majority of the parents are presently not involved but desire involvement. For eighteen of the fifty tasks analyzed the majority of the parents are presently not involved and desire not to be involved. For the remaining seven tasks analyzed the majority of the parents are presently involved and desire involvement. For no tasks was it found that the majority are presently involved but desire no involvement.

The study further revealed that all parents found the term, parent involvement, to be extremely difficult to define. When asked: "What do you like most about parent involvement?" slightly over sixty per cent of the subjects' responses centered around their desire to have an interest in and an awareness of their child's progress in the program. Over sixty per cent of the subjects were of the opinion that only parents that want to be involved should be and that each parent should have the right to make this decision. Slightly over one-half of the subjects were of the opinion that the Local Advisory Committee was a useful committee because according to E.C.S. guidelines a committee must be struck before government

funding is to be granted. Over one-third of the respondents were uncertain as to the usefulness of the L.A.C. since they had no knowledge of the function of this committee. Over one-quarter of the subjects expressed the opinion that parent involvement could be improved through greater acceptance of parents by teachers and administrators.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with deepest appreciation and gratitude that I thank the following people for their contribution to both this thesis and my Master's Degree.

Dr. I. Hastings of Early Childhood Services, Mrs. K. Chernowski of the Edmonton Public School Board and the principals and staffs of the schools for their co-operation and advice.

Dr. N. Hersom, Dr. J. Bishop, Mrs. S. Campbell and Miss J. Blakely for their help in the development of the instruments.

The respondents of the survey checklist-questionnaire and the parents interviewed for their time and co-operation.

Dr. D. Friesen for his willingness to serve on my committee and for his suggestions and criticisms. Dr. M. Affleck and Dr. A. MacKay for constant advice and encouragement and for serving on my thesis committee.

Dr. M. Horowitz for serving as my advisor and chairman of my thesis committee and for his guidance and assistance throughout the course of the study and for being a friend when one was needed.

My husband, Rex, for his help, co-operation, inspiration and total understanding, without which none of this could have been started, fostered or completed. To Sandy and Randy for being so patient during the progress of this investigation.

My sincere thanks and love are extended to all these people respectively.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE PROBLEM 1

Introduction and Background to the Problem 1

Statement of the Problem 2

Experimental Setting 3

Definition of Key Terms 4

Assumptions Made in the Study 5

Limitations of the Study 5

Summary 6

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH 8

Literature and Research on Parental Involvement 8

The Alberta Scene 26

Summary 29

III. PROCEDURE 30

Overview 30

Utilization of the Checklist-Questionnaire and Selected Interviewing as a Means of Soliciting Parental Opinions 30

Development of the Checklist-Questionnaire 33

Development of the Interview Schedule 35

Objectives of the Interview Schedule Items 36

Pilot Study 37

The Sample 38

Data Collection 40

Summary 42

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 43

Purpose of the Chapter 43

Description of Responses to Checklist-Questionnaire Tasks 44

Total Checklist-Questionnaire 44

Category One—Service Category 46

Category Two—Instructional Support Category . . . 70

Category Three—Decision-Making Category 89

Category Four—Administrative Category 105

Category Five—Parent Growth and Development Category 123

Summary of Results of Checklist-Questionnaire Tasks 135

Description of Responses to Interview Items 136

Response Variations between L.A.C. and Non-L.A.C. Parents 164

V. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 168

Summary of the Study 168

Conclusions 169

Recommendations for Further Research 175

Implications 176

BIBLIOGRAPHY 179

APPENDIX A. Checklist-Questionnaire 188

APPENDIX B. Guide to the Schedule and Interview Schedule . . . 196

APPENDIX C. Letter of Introduction 201

APPENDIX D. Ranking of Tasks for Present Involvement 203

APPENDIX E. Ranking of Tasks for Desired Involvement 206

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Analysis of Responses to the Checklist-Questionnaire 39

II. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to the Total Checklist 45

III. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Service Category 47

IV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 2 Supervising bathroom breaks 48

V. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 4 Collecting 'junk' for classroom use, e.g., egg cartons, buttons 50

VI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 9 Doing clerical work, e.g., typing, duplicating materials 51

VII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 11 Preparing art and craft materials 53

VIII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 12 Sewing, e.g., costumes, curtains, puppets 55

IX. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 14 Laminating parent and teacher made materials 56

X. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 19 Supervising crosswalks 57

XI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 23 Helping to arrange and set out equipment and materials 59

XII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 33 Serving on a telephone committee 61

XIII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 34 Constructing tables, blocks, animal cages, etc., for classroom use 62

XIV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 39 Preparing snacks (juice and cookies) 64

TABLE PAGE

XV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 46
Preparing materials for the children's program, e.g., charts, puzzles 66

XVI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 48
Helping children dress and undress (clothing, footwear) in the classroom 67

XVII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 50
Tidying and cleaning up in the classroom 69

XVIII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Instructional Support Category 71

XIX. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 5
Supervising small group activities 72

XX. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 6
Responding to children's questions in the classroom 74

XXI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 7
Leading small group discussions with children 75

XXII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 8
Supervising snacks (juice and cookies) 77

XXIII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 16
Working in an activity center with small groups of children 79

XXIV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 18
Talking to children about your work, hobbies, etc. . 80

XXV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 24
Explaining to children reasons for observing class rules 82

XXVI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 28
Reading and/or telling stories to children 83

XXVII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 29
Assisting with outdoor play activities 85

XXVIII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 37
Assisting in music activities 87

XXIX. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 41
Assisting in the supervision of fieldtrips 88

TABLE PAGE

XXX. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Decision-Making Category 90

XXXI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 3 Selecting program personnel, e.g., teachers, teacher-aides 92

XXXII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 15 Choosing materials for the children's program 93

XXXIII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 22 Assessing program needs 95

XXXIV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 25 Choosing equipment for the children's program 96

XXXV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 27 Planning and organizing fieldtrips 98

XXXVI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 31 Setting program goals and objectives 99

XXXVII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 35 Planning the children's program 101

XXXVIII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 36 Preparing the program budget 103

XXXIX. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 38 Evaluating the objectives and goals of the children's program 104

XL. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Administrative Category 106

XLI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 1 Completing the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' application forms 108

XLII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 10 Interviewing program personnel, e.g., teachers, teacher-aides 109

XLIII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 17 Serving on the Local Advisory Committee (L.A.C.) . . 111

XLIV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 20 Purchasing equipment for the children's program as ordered by the teacher 113

TABLE PAGE

XLV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 26 Preparing a newsletter to keep parents informed 114

XLVI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 30 Organizing fund raising events, e.g., raffles, tea and bake sales 116

XLVII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 40 Securing cost estimates for supplies and equipment for the children's program 117

XLVIII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 42 Organizing the duty roster 119

XLIX. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 47 Organizing a parent study group 121

L. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 49 Purchasing materials for the children's program . . . 122

LI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Parent Growth and Development Category 124

LII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 13 Participating in study-group sessions on child development, nutrition, language development, etc.. 126

LIII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 21 Reading articles or books on child development 127

LIV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 32 Observing children in a 'Kindergarten' classroom 129

LV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 43 Viewing films, slides, etc., in the parent program 131

LVI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 44 Participating in workshops and leadership training sessions 132

LVII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Task 45 Discussing the children's program with the teacher, nurse, counsellor, etc. 134

LVIII. Summary of Findings of Checklist-Questionnaire 137

TABLE PAGE

LIX. Analysis of Respondents Description to the Definition of Parental Involvement 142

LX. Analysis of Responses to Interview Schedule
Item 4
What do you like most about parental involvement? 143

LXI. Analysis of Responses to Interview Schedule
Item 5
What do you like least about parental involvement? 145

LXII. Analysis of Responses to Interview Schedule
Item 6
Some people feel that all parents should be involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. Other people feel that only those who want to be involved should be. How do you personally feel about this? 149

LXIII. Analysis of Responses to Interview Schedule
Item 7
In what ways might fathers become more involved in the program? 152

LXIV. Analysis of Responses to Interview Schedule
Item 9
Name the three tasks in which you were most involved? 156

LXV. Analysis of Responses to Interview Schedule
Item 11
Please describe briefly the work of this committee? 159

LXVI. Analysis of Responses to Interview Schedule
Item 12
In what ways do you feel that the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program that your child attends could be most improved particularly in the area of parental involvement? 165

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

In the spring of 1973 the Alberta provincial government established the Early Childhood Services (E.C.S.) program in conjunction with the departments of Education; Health and Social Development; Culture, Youth and Recreation and Advanced Education, with departments such as Agriculture and Manpower and Labour providing special services (Government of Alberta, 1973, p. i).

According to the Operations Handbook (Government of Alberta, 1973) the central purpose of E.C.S. is to develop and implement effective programs to meet the specific needs of pre-school children. Any emphasis placed upon parent, staff and community programs should have, as its ultimate purpose, the enhancement of the quality of life of children. This is the underlying factor in planning and implementing programs at all levels.

One prerequisite for implementing an E.C.S. program in a given community is parental involvement. E.C.S. will not "endorse, approve, or financially support" programs which do not have the commitment of parents:

> . . . involvement and co-operation of parents and community agencies in the decision-making process which affect vital areas of their own and their children's lives is strongly endorsed (Government of Alberta, 1973, p. 18).

To receive governmental financial support operators of E.C.S.

'kindergarten' programs must also establish a Local Advisory Committee (L.A.C.). E.C.S. policy states that to be effective programs must have a strong commitment on the part of parents of children and the local community.

With an enrolment of approximately 25,000 children between the ages of 4 1/2 and 5 1/2 years, the E.C.S. program is now well into its second year of operation (Government of Alberta, 1975). However little research or evaluation concerning parent involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs has been conducted.

Parent involvement has become somewhat controversial in the early childhood 'kindergarten' programs and although a paucity of research supports the value and the necessity of parental involvement, no research, in the writer's knowledge, has been conducted with regard to parental perception of 'kindergarten' involvement.

This study is a descriptive survey, undertaken and designed to explore the perceptions held by a selected group of parents about certain variables related to parental involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The central problem of this study is to examine the attitudes and opinions held by parents concerning their involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs with respect to the following research questions:

1. What does parent involvement mean to the respondent?
2. How do parents feel about parental involvement?

3. How are parents presently involved in the program?

4. How do parents desire to be involved in the program?

5. What are the parents' perceptions of the Local Advisory Committee?

6. How can parental involvement be improved?

These six questions served as the framework for formulating the tasks in the checklist-questionnaire and the items in the interview schedule. The study also attempted to determine if there are any relationships between the attitudes and opinions concerning parent involvement in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs held by parents actively involved on Local Advisory Committees and parents who are not involved on L.A.C.'s.

The first section of the investigation consists of a checklist-questionnaire containing fifty tasks designed to determine the present and desired involvement of parents in the program with regard to the following five areas: service, instructional support, decision-making, administration and parent growth and development. The second section of the investigation consists of an interview with selected parents.

III. EXPERIMENTAL SETTING

The population for the investigation consists of all parents whose children attended a funded E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program in an Edmonton Public School during the 1974-75 school year. From this population six participating schools were selected. All the parents, whose children attended the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program in these schools, constituted the subjects for the study. The size of the sample was three hundred and forty-two. From this sample a randomly selected number of forty-two parents—seven from each school, two L.A.C. parents and five non-L.A.C. parents—were interviewed for the study.

IV. DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

For the purposes of this survey and report, the following meanings were attached to specific terms:

Task. An activity related to a specific function that parents perform as part of their involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs.

Attitude. A state of mind regarding some matter, as indicating opinion or purpose.

Opinion. A view, judgment, or appraisal formed in the mind about a particular matter or particular matters (Webster, 1971, p. 1582). The terms "comment" and "feeling" were used synonymously in the interviews.

Parent involvement. Parents, whose children attend a funded E.C.S. program, who gave of their time and service in implementing and operating the particular program in their community.

Local Advisory Committee (L.A.C.). A committee consisting of a co-ordinator (generally the teacher or principal), representatives of interested community agencies (public health, preventive social services, parks and recreation, etc.) and a majority of parents whose function is the planning, development and operation of the program and provision for direct contact and involvement with the community (Government of Alberta, 1973, p. 14-18).

Majority. 50.0 per cent or more of the respondents.

V. ASSUMPTIONS MADE IN THE STUDY

In order to proceed with the investigation and to interpret and formulate conclusions from the collected data, it was necessary to make the following assumptions:

(1) The checklist-questionnaire represents an accurate and complete description of the tasks.

(2) The tasks as described would be perceived similarly by all subjects involved in the study.

(3) The subjects' perceptions of tasks performed is a basis for determining parent involvement.

(4) Parents have definite views concerning parental involvement and these opinions are measurable.

(5) The responses to the checklist-questionnaire will accurately reflect the ways in which parents in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs have been involved during the 1974-75 school year.

(6) The study will provide information to be of value to the University, E.C.S., the Edmonton Public School Board and the researcher.

VI. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The validity of the findings of this investigation is limited in the following ways:

(1) Individual interpretation of the tasks may have varied somewhat from subject to subject.

(2) Because the respondents questioned in the investigation have children in a particular school system, the results are generalizable beyond that system in only a limited way.

(3) There are other important groups, for example, teachers and administrators, who undoubtedly hold certain opinions toward parental involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs. These attitudes, although they certainly would be relevant in a study of parental involvement, are not examined here.

(4) Parents, who have been inundated by forms for completion, may be reluctant to respond to the checklist-questionnaire.

(5) Parents, who view parental involvement as a positive component of the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program, would be motivated to respond and return the checklist-questionnaire. Parents with negative or indifferent attitudes might not respond at all.

VII. SUMMARY

The foregoing chapter has introduced the reader to the study, presented the problem to be investigated, stated the research questions and discussed the assumptions and limitations of the study.

The remainder of the report is present in the following chapters:

Chapter II - Review of Related Literature and Research

Chapter III - Procedure

Chapter IV - Analysis of the Data

Chapter V - Summary of the Study, Conclusions, Recommendations for Further Research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

In this chapter the literature related to this study is reviewed under the following headings:

(1) Literature and Research on Parental Involvement

(2) The Alberta Scene.

I. LITERATURE AND RESEARCH ON PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

Parent involvement prior to the 1950's consisted primarily through organizations such as the Parent Teacher Association (P.T.A.). In the last decade considerable interest has arisen in developing more cogent ties between parents and the school. No other issue on the urban scene is as strategic as that of citizen participation (Bourgeois, 1969, p. 243). However, it is well to note that as far back as 1537 the value of parental involvement was noted:

> Parents and teachers should not only be acquainted with each other . . . Parents and teachers should be familiarly linked together in amity and continual conference for their common charge, and each should trust in the judgment and personal good will of the other (Lombard, 1937, p. 1).

Three hundred years later the first National Congress of Mothers held its convention. This body was the forerunner of what is known today as the P.T.A., one of the largest parent involvement groups in the United States. While the P.T.A. has an extremely large membership it has tended to become more social than political (Koerner, 1961).

Unlike programs for older children, early childhood programs often rely heavily on the involvement of parents. Part of this arises from the early history of early childhood education programs which placed almost as much emphasis on the education of mothers as it did on the education of the young children. Contrary to critics of early childhood education who argue that schools will replace the home in the rearing of the child, kindergartens have often been created by the parents whose children they were designed to serve. Parents have definite ideas regarding what experiences they desire for their youngsters and many of them are willing to invest considerable effort in achieving what they want.

It is the popular belief in Canada that parents have the right to rear their offspring as they see fit. In actual practice, the right of the parent to raise his children as he chooses is abridged in a number of ways to ensure the safety and education of the child. Most provinces legislate compulsory education. Every parent must send his child to school during certain years of the child's life. This legal requirement grows as much out of the cultural need to maintain the social order as from the personal needs of children and their parents (Spodek, 1972, p. 257).

Parents make the decision to enroll their child in an early childhood program and to keep him there, since education is usually not compulsory until the child is six years of age. How the parent feels about the particular early childhood program and the teacher is of extreme importance to the parent, the school and the child. Both the home and the school have a responsibility for what happens to the child, and neither can work completely independently of the other. The most desirable program for the child results only if a co-operative working relationship is established.

Recognizing the family as the prime agent of socialization and education, sociologists, psychologists and educators have concluded that the family unit is the setting in which personality, motivation for learning and development of achievement behaviors are initiated (Bloom, 1964; Goodacre, 1970; Shipman, 1972; Borghi, 1974). Investigations and research concerning family factors associated with intellectual and personality behavior and development indicate that the family is the key factor in the learning processes and development of the child (Gordon, 1968, p. 24).

Some educators have taken the position that the school system must take the initiative in the fostering of parent involvement. It is further felt that the home should be the place for involvement, but, if it cannot be accomplished there, then the school must do it. Fusco (1966) claims:

> Generally parents are interested in their children's education and are eager for them to succeed in school; their seeming indifference and apathy reflect their lack of knowledge regarding the nature of the demands the school will place on their children and their lack of skills concerning ways in which they can prepare their children for the transition from home to school, and reinforce and support school efforts made on behalf of their children (p. 145).

Fusco's conclusion is that the school must take the initiative. It has been found, however, that parents often view the school with skepticism and pessimism and are not interested in the imposition of school values and attitudes upon their way of life (Koerner, 1961). Liddle and Rockwell (1966) point out:

> . . . adults do not have to be well educated to be intellectually stimulating to young children . . . parents can learn to play the important function of showing, telling, and listening to their children (p. 398).

They suggest some type of home-school liaison program which reflects the desire to have the parent accept the school model and learn to implement it at home.

Other investigators claim that the socio-cultural environment determines different patterns of abilities, and that changing the social class position characteristics would presumably lead to the greatest comparable change in performance (Clausen, 1968; McCandless, 1968; Margolin, 1974). This leads to the assumption that the school may be incorrect in its model and that parental involvement requires changing the school rather than changing the family. These views are similar to Moynihan's (1965) opinion that schools deal only with the education aspect and fail to be concerned with other family life situations.

The advent of research indicating the importance of the home to the growth and development of the child has been parallelled by a movement to establish improved relationships between home and school (Sharrock, 1970). With little attention to any alienation which has existed between the two institutions (Taylor, 1972), home and school are being exhorted to enter into a partnership (Beyer, 1959; Sayler, 1971; Newman, 1971). A number of authors urge that the schools provide more information for parents concerning educational programs and methods and parental involvement (Heffernan and Todd, 1969; Lewis, 1970; Taylor, 1972; Spodek, 1973).

Sharrock (1970) in reviewing the research on home and school relations indicated that although research into this field had increased since the mid-sixties, the area dealing specifically with types of parental involvement and their extent and effectiveness remained relatively unexplored. Research of this nature, most of which has been conducted in British primary and secondary schools, shows that attempts have been made to determine the number of Parent-Teacher Associations in operation. There is, however, little, apart from small scale surveys, to indicate their range of activities. The Plowden Report (1967) and Green (1968) gave some indication of the range of contacts existing between parents and teachers, but little evidence of their effectiveness.

Research in the field of parental involvement by various institutions and agencies has no common characteristics in either goals or design. To some degree, all one can learn is that a variety of procedures have been tried, that goals and evaluations have not been clearly specified, and that most judgments are subjective.

We speak of parent participation or parent involvement in education but at what level of the educational process is the parent really involved? According to Gordon (1968), Hess et al, (1971), Greenwood, Brievogel and Bissent (1972), and Pomfret (1972) there are five levels or categories of parent involvement: parents as supporters, educators, teacher assistants, clerical assistants and decision-makers.

At the first level, parent involvement or participation means that parents will either be an audience getting the message and listening to the word or they will be involved as bystanders and observers visiting the school to see what the professional teacher does.

When we move one step higher and seek to involve the parent as a direct and active teacher of the child, what is it we will ask him or her to teach? Questionnaires and observations, however, reflect the bias of changing the family pattern to meet the schools' and professionals' concepts of what the home ought to be.

At a third level, when parents are involved in active roles in the school as aides and volunteers, the major thrust is the change of the parent rather than the change in the school. The goal would seem to be to change or help the child, or to change or help the parent. If change is the goal, changes in skills and attitudes would be affected.

A fourth level would involve the parent as a trained paid worker in the school setting. Although all these types of involvement imply a change in the value system of the parent, is not such participation usually designed to provide support for goals already established by professionals?

A fifth approach to parental participation and involvement has been suggested in the form of parent control of the school board and school system. Although this may seem revolutionary when proposed for urban parents, actually the right to elect school boards, to participate in decision-making and to help set the tax burden, is enjoyed by most rural parents. Decentralization of the school districts in large urban areas is another example of the attempt to bring the school system under local control. When we move to local control, the parents, rather than being recipients, become participants in decision-making about curriculum, textbooks, instruction, selection of teachers and perhaps even the training of teachers.

A multiplicity of programs have been developed and implemented resulting in many parents becoming involved as participants of such programs. Parent participation or involvement runs the gamut of all these levels in early childhood programs and it is difficult to say which models work best under given conditions. To compensate for the considerable variation of parental roles in early childhood programs some attempts are being made to classify and categorize the task assigned roles (Calvert, 1971; Hess et al, 1971; Early Childhood Services, 1974).

During the last decade, parent involvement programs have received impetus from three major areas. Programs have originated as university-research projects, as efforts from local school systems or community agencies and as Federally supported national programs in the United States.

University Research Programs

The brief descriptions of the following programs are selective rather than comprehensive due to the newness of the field and the inconclusive findings of projects still in progress. Other university and college research projects involving parents are underway at other major institutions using designs analogous to those described below. The aspects of the programs which emphasize parent involvement will be discussed here.

Boston University Project — The initial approach to parents to solicit attendance of their children to the school was made through a professional family worker. Once the child was in school, the teacher was responsible for maintaining continuous contact through home visits and daily formal and informal contact with mothers.

The basic parental involvement procedure, beyond the almost daily contact between teacher and mother, was case work. The family work was carried on by social workers and a public health nurse. There was no "formal curriculum" of parent education and the usual case work procedures were the main technique employed. Parental involvement rested predominantly with the teacher and the social workers. The former was concerned with the child; the latter with the parents.

Peabody College Project — This project in 1961 focused on the conditions of the home. The goal was to have the mother see herself as a teacher and to involve her as an active participant. Klau and Gray (1967) in their report of the project stated:

> . . . most of the mothers carried responsibilities that sapped their energies, both physical and emotional; thus, any requests that demanded additional time and energies would seem overwhelming (p. 18).

The essential features were a combination of a cognitive orientation, a pre-school program and follow-up into regular school accompanied by a systematic home visitory program using professionals to assist the mother in supplementing the child's educational experience.

University of Illinois Project — This project was designed to study the effect that short-term parent training in instruction would have on the intellectual and language development of the child. Three teachers, experienced in pre-school education, instructed the mothers on how to make educational games and toys from inexpensive materials found in their homes, helping them to understand ways to use the materials.

In essence, this program was similar to the Peabody program in that it focused on helping the mother to serve as a teacher. The essential difference was the direct involvement of the parent in the creation and utilization of teaching materials. This is far removed from the case work orientation of the Boston project and one step up the line of parental involvement from the home visitor program at Peabody College.

Howard University Project — The major objective, in addition to helping the children, was:

> . . . to help the children's parents participate in and contribute to their children's enlarged experience and to widen their own interests and knowledge so that they might make use of the facilities and opportunities available in their neighborhoods and in their communities (Kittrell, 1968, p. 135).

The program consisted of group meetings, held at the school or in the neighborhood, in which the parents worked together to make things for the school and discussed various child care concerns such as nutrition and ways to answer children's questions. The second phase of the program consisted of individual parent visits to the school to observe children and to participate as volunteers to help the teacher.

In comparison with the Illinois and Peabody projects there was no organized curriculum for parents beyond involvement and the utilization of parental questions and concerns as they emerged as guidelines for the teacher and other staff members in providing information for the parents. The parent program resembled that of the parent co-operative nursery school plus the special features of home visitation.

University of Florida Project — The Florida Education Program, one of the better known projects, headed by Gordon (1968) is a home tutoring program designed to teach the mother special sequential tasks to use with her infant beginning at age three months and continuing through age two.

One of the essential differences between this program and other home visit programs is the use of the paraprofessional as the home visitor. This required a careful training program and a continuous in-service program for the parent educators. As in the case of other projects mentioned, there were difficulties encountered in establishing and maintaining relationships.

As in the case of the Illinois project, the parent educators assisted in the development and assessment of the instructional materials and taught them to other mothers in their homes. The other programs use direct communication between professional and parent; here the communication bridge is provided by another parent specially trained to play the role of parent-educator. The investigation indicated that a relationship between the parent-educator and the mother can be sustained over time and that the children involved do benefit.

Implications of University Programs: An analysis of the assessment measures used to test the achievement of program goals seem to indicate that there is almost a complete lack of measures of change in parents other than those gleaned from anecdotes or interviews. Several factors may account for this: (1) the difficulty of measuring parental growth and involvement; (2) the project directors' decision that the measurement of children would be the best way of measuring the effectiveness of work with parents; and (3) lack of adequate measurement devices.

Although the data collected to date on the effectiveness of parent involvement in changing parent attitudes and behavior pertaining to the growth of their children is inconclusive, there seems to be some indication that it is possible to involve parents successfully in the educational process.

Local Programs: School and Community

There are a multitude of education programs in progress in the United States involving parent participation. Selection of the following programs is based on the general criterion that parent involvement should be more than a teacher home visit or social work program or pupil parent counselling. Some current studies have been omitted since the evaluation of the programs has not yet been completed. The general research literature in education was searched for specific research reports on parental involvement. However, very few programs list in systematic fashion their goals for parents and their design characteristics.

Pittsburgh School System — Parents were utilized as preschool aides, as many as four or five in the classroom. They conducted some supervision of play, storytelling and other duties. Home-school relations were conducted by a highly trained professional who served as a liaison between the principal and the community. In other programs this role has been turned over to the paraprofessional who was a parent in the community. The pre-primary program set aside one day a week for group parent meetings in which all younger siblings came to school and the parents worked with their own children.

Baltimore City Schools — This project used group activities based on parental concerns and it provided for home visits, individual conferences, visitation to the classroom and trips with children. The project directors made no effort to conduct traditional parent education classes but felt instead that parent activities had to be unstructured and informal and that they had to be suggested by the parents themselves during home visits, conferences and classroom visitations.

Although the report states that thousands of parents participated in a variety of activities and services, this participation is again on the recipient level since parents are told by the school about ways in which they may help their children.

San Diego Schools — As part of its adult education program, a parent participation class for twenty-five to thirty parents and their three-to-five year old children was instituted. All parents attended one evening a week and also went to school the three mornings a week when their children were in nursery school. The parent served as teacher assistant as well as an observer and participated in group work in child development. Goals of the program were to enable the parents to understand the child, understand themselves and strengthen parent-child relationships and improve family life.

The program had a heavy emphasis on the interpersonal relationships and personality development and much lighter emphasis on organized or systematic cognitive programs.

In contrast to the Baltimore and Pittsburgh programs, the parents in the San Diego program act in the capacity of an advisory committee. This moves them a step upward in terms of involvement from the recipient category.

Ypsilanti Schools — The main emphasis involved home teaching in three different programs between 1962 and 1967. The present program in Ypsilanti is a system-wide application synthesizing what was learned from these programs.

In evaluating the program, Radin and Sonquist (1968) stated:

> . . . although these results are only tentative in view of the small number involved, they do corroborate the view of the staff that the program is most effective in reaching parents who are predisposed to fostering their child's intellectual development but lack the methodology. The project is least effective with alienated, dejected parents (p. 15).

As contrasted with the San Diego program, which concentrated on parent emotional factors, the emphasis here was on parental cognitive factors.

Hempstead, Long Island — The parental involvement component of this pre-kindergarten experimental program included parent interviews in the fall, a minimum of one home visit per semester and parent education meetings held weekly. The focus of the work with parents was aimed at enlisting their co-operation and finding out what medical or social worker services were needed by the child.

The staff were all professional. It may therefore be perceived that the parent is the recipient of aid rather than a partner in the school enterprise, as contrasted with the view held in the San Diego preschool program.

Implications of Local Programs — The following are characteristic of most of the school-home parent involvement programs which have been outlined:

1. A home visitor program which involves trained personnel to inform parents about schools and educational techniques, informs schools about home environments and problems, and/or provides for parent or child counselling.

2. Parents participating in school and classroom activities; information disseminated and discussed concerning all phases of family life with emphasis on child development.

3. Literature, newsletters, fieldtrips used to involve parents in school activities.
4. Use of parent talent in the schools, in the form of classroom aides, parent aides and professional staff.

Most of the early childhood programs stress combinations of the above four characteristics, approaching the parent involvement component in different ways due to basic differences in orientation.

It seems that some school systems see the parent as a recipient of aid and view parental involvement mainly as a technique for getting the parent to understand the school and co-operate with the ongoing school program. Many of the programs do not seem to involve parents at any level of the decision-making process. There does not seem to be much effort to understand what parents want which might modify the school's organization, curriculum or teaching style to meet community needs.

There seems to be no stated objectives by educators as to why they seek an improved home-school relationship beyond the general implication that a co-operative climate is to be desired. Most programs do not specify what changes they are seeking in home characteristics which might occur because of improved relationships between home and school. Nevertheless, the efforts at parental involvement do represent a great step forward from the P.T.A. approach and do indicate a desire to communicate and to work closely with parents to improve existing conditions.

National Programs

The Office of Economic Opportunity (O.E.O.) funded programs of Head Start, Parent Child Centers and Follow Through are U.S.

national programs which emphasize active parent involvement. These national programs have built their programs upon the research developed by the universities and local community programs during the last decade. The emphasis on parent involvement, however, is based on the assumption that parents are not to be seen simply as recipients of aid but as active partners in the child development process.

Head Start — The Head Start program began in 1965 as a crash summer program in many large urban areas and has developed, in most cases, into a year round child development program. The O.E.O. guidelines for Head Start and Parent Child Centers reflects its view concerning the decision-making power of the parent:

> The opportunity for parents to take part in making decisions is a major goal of the Head Start program . . . perhaps the most important parental decision-making can center around pinpointing the needs of their children. Parents know the home background, the problems they face and the order in which they feel these problems ought to be met.
>
> The advice of parents is essential in planning and carrying forth the Head Start Child Development Program. Parents should have a chance at the very earliest stages of organization to make suggestions and recommendations as members of planning and advisory groups. Parents' representatives should be chosen through democratic methods (1967, p. 14).

The structure of Head Start differs from that of the other programs described in its requirements for parental involvement in decision-making and organization. In addition to serving on advisory committees, parents are encouraged to volunteer their services as well as to seek employment as teacher aides, community aides and the like, and to participate in opportunities for parent education. Such education may include child development, nutrition and family life activity.

As to the effects of parent involvement, a summary of research indicated that:

> . . . those parents who volunteered to participate seem to feel less alienated, felt more positively toward the program, made greater use of community services and had more intact family structures than comparable non-Head Start families (McDavid, 1967, p. 4).

It has also been found that children whose parents were voluntary participants in Head Start continue to do better than children whose parents had been actively recruited for participating in the program. This might indicate that the initial group of voluntary parents had more interest and positive attitudes to begin with than did others who did not participate. Parents felt that the program was beneficial to their children and that in learning about child development and child rearing their aspirations were raised. As in most programs of parent involvement, the problem of reaching the most difficult group of parents—those who are apathetic—has not been solved.

Although most parents view the program positively, evaluators comment that more parent participation should be encouraged by intensively involving parents in the Center's activities, by more imaginative means of strengthening the relationship between home and school and through greater emphasis on the importance of the home's reinforcement of the school's efforts.

Parent Child Centers — This program began in 1968 and was planned to be a comprehensive program emphasizing the family as the agency to be served. Intellectual stimulation activities begin with prenatal education of the mother, a program of stimulation in infancy, day care and an education program for the parents in child development. As in Head Start, parental involvement may take many forms from serving on advisory boards to receiving aid. Each center must have parents and other community personnel on the planning committee and on the policy advisory committee.

This program represents a downward and upward extension of Head Start with emphasis on the prevailing theory of the importance of the early years in setting the stage for both intellectual and personality development.

Follow Through Program — This is an upward extension of Head Start, begun in the fall of 1967 on a pilot basis in forty communities. It came into being because evaluations of Head Start indicated that many children who showed gains in the Head Start programs were not maintaining those gains in a conventional school program. The Follow Through Program was designed to carry the Head Start comprehensive service for children into first grade, with a plan to maintain these services into the third grade.

Implications of U.S. National Programs — The emphasis of the U.S. Federally funded programs concerning the child and his family is expanded from previous research programs at the university and local level. These programs strive to serve the child and his family from birth through third grade. Each allows for and encourages parental involvement at all levels of participation. Each provides medical and social services, as well as educational opportunities for child and parent. Each allows for great diversity in implementation and generally reflects Federal support without stifling restrictive controls.

The continued effectiveness of these programs and their maintenance are dependent upon continuous funding rather than the present year-to-year operation and upon longitudinal research studies to determine the effectiveness of the programs.

II. THE ALBERTA SCENE

Until March of 1973 Alberta was one of the few provinces in Canada without a program for preschool children. Several factors retarded the establishment of publicly supported kindergartens in this province: (1) some rural areas were opposed to kindergartens because of the estimated costs and distances of travel for the youngsters; (2) intense public concern that the establishment of kindergartens would add considerably to the total education budget; and (3) lack of research indicating that the establishment of kindergarten is beneficial for youngsters. The Alberta Human Resources Research Council, in its annual report for 1971, claimed that only 2.2 per cent of Alberta's five year olds were attending kindergartens compared to the national average of 60 per cent and that Alberta was the only province then that had no commitment with respect to future plans for comprehensive public school kindergarten programs. The Worth Commission (1972) reported overwhelming support for tax-supported kindergartens and strongly advocated that universal kindergartens be established in Alberta.

Worth (1972) suggested that "Early education before the age of six should have three major functions: stimulation, identification and socialization." He further stated:

> Opportunities should be offered for learning a variety of attitudes, skills and behaviors which will promote aesthetic, emotional, intellectual and physical development. This does not mean a downward extension of conventional schooling; rather it means approaching each child on his terms . . . The purpose is not readiness or academic basic training in the traditional sense but the launching of human quest for self-fulfillment. Wide ranging exploration must take precedence over narrow preparation (p. 50).

The Worth Commission Report (1972) also emphasized the importance of involving the family and the community in the total framework of early education:

> . . . Early Education, the home and the community must be complementary to and not substitute for each other (p. 51).

In March, 1973, the Government of Alberta outlined its future plans for Early Childhood Services on the basis of the Worth Commission Report, the Minister's Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education and a policy paper entitled "Opportunities for Infants" by L. W. Downey Research Associates. The plans provided for:

a) strengthening the role of the family as a first and fundamental influence on child development;

b) the early detection of health, mental and educational handicaps;

c) the provision of remedial and preventative health programs on a priority basis to children and parents of children who need special services (1973, p. 2).

Any incorporated, non-profit community organization or local school authority may operate an E.C.S. program provided it meets guidelines, established by the Department of Education, related to program emphasis, staffing requirements and facilities.

Early Childhood Services involves the co-ordinated planning, integration and delivery of services to young children and their families. An E.C.S. program is a planned set of activities which have been developed to meet the specific needs of young children and their parents in a particular community. Such a program has activities for both children and parents and includes plans for coordination and utilization of resources available in the community. The program encourages parents to be involved in the planning and operation of the children's programs.

The main goal for providing services to young children and their families is to help strengthen the sense of dignity and self worth within the child and the child's family. In recognizing the importance of the parents in the education of their children, parent education and involvement is an integral part of the program:

> E.C.S. envisages a strong involvement of parent and community agencies in the decision-making and general operation of the programs at the local level. This is based upon the premise that active involvement of parents and community agencies is necessary to providing effective programs (Operations Handbook, 1973, p. 22).

The Early Childhood Services Branch has affirmed its belief that one institution operating without the support of the other is ineffective. Parental commitment, therefore, is necessary to obtain financial support for the program:

> Parent program activities are essential to support a claim for grants on behalf of children. Each center is required to maintain a log of parent and community activities (Program and Services Guide, 1974, p. 4).

Thus involvement of the parents and the community is an essential aspect of the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. The program is planned by the Local Advisory Committee (L.A.C.) which consists of the principal or vice-principal, teacher, representatives of local agencies within each community and a majority of parents. The purpose is to provide each child with the opportunity to grow socially, physically, intellectually, emotionally and culturally. Since learning in young children takes place continuously, the primary way in which children learn about the world is through play and other experiences offered to them at home, school and the community.

III. SUMMARY

This chapter presented a two part discussion of the theoretical framework upon which the investigation is based. The first section discussed parent involvement in early childhood programs with reference being made to a number of programs through documentation of related literature. The second section of the discussion outlined the Early Childhood Services program in Alberta.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

I. OVERVIEW

The main problem was to examine the attitudes and opinions held by parents concerning their involvement in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program.

To secure data relating to the above stated problem, 342 parents in six schools received a checklist-questionnaire to complete and forty-two of these parents were selected to be interviewed.

This chapter contains a discussion of the checklist-questionnaire and interview as techniques for data collection, the instrumentation, the pilot study, sampling procedures and data collection.

II. UTILIZATION OF THE CHECKLIST-QUESTIONNAIRE AND SELECTED INTERVIEWING AS A MEANS OF SOLICITING PARENTAL OPINIONS

This study utilizes two major methods of data collection: checklist-questionnaire response and individual interviews. Both of these survey techniques are most widely used in evaluating and measuring opinions.

The checklist-questionnaire, as a technique for collecting data, has been selected because, in its anonymity, it gives the respondent the opportunity to express freely his opinions concerning his involvement since the checklist-questionnaire eliminates any "social pressure." Murphy et al (1931) state that "actions are frequently designed to distract or conceal 'true opinion' . . . All behavior is subject to modification of courtesy expediency or social pressure" (p. 912). Such 'social pressure' for concealing 'true opinions' occurs in both verbal and nonverbal behavior. Hence the researcher was most careful in emphasizing the anonymity of the checklist-questionnaire responses in attempting to lessen the effect of 'social considerations.'

Some of the disadvantages of using a checklist-questionnaire involves the wording of questions so that a variety of respondents with differing backgrounds will understand it in the same manner. Remmers and Gage (1955) state that this problem can never be eliminated: "At best it is possible only to minimize the errors arising from the source, they can not be eliminated completely" (p. 384). A further disadvantage of the checklist-questionnaire is that only a small proportion of respondents return the questionnaire (Kerlinger, 1964; Good, 1966; Fox, 1969).

The collection of the respondent data from the checklist-questionnaire was supplemented by interviewing. Interviewing, as a technique for collecting data, was selected because there are several purposes to be achieved by the interview that can not be achieved by other methods. Interviews may reveal important variables. The exploratory interview offers a means of discovering relations among variables, and thus, for setting up hypotheses for further testing (Sanford, 1966, p. 608). An interview approach makes a study involving many variables cohesive (Wrightstone, 1956, p. 158).

Gronlund (1965) advocates the use of supplementary interviewing:

> Attitude scales, like other self-reporting techniques, provide verbal expressions of feelings and opinions that individuals are willing to make known to others . . . Even under the most ideal conditions however, it is desirable to supplement attitudes determined by self-report methods with evidence obtained from direct observation (p. 356-357).

Kerlinger states that interviews produce data about the respondents' behavior which must have come from them or originated with other people. He further states that interviews form the beliefs, opinions, attitudes and feelings that respondents have about objects with an estimate of their own reasons for doing or believing something (1973, p. 413).

This investigator employed an unstructured interview technique where the questioning was guided by an interview schedule. Gronlund (1965) claims:

> The flexibility of the unstructured interview makes it possible for the interviewer to pursue promising leads which arise spontaneously and for the interviewee to elaborate upon his answers until he is certain that his feelings and attitudes are clearly understood (p. 12-13).

Utilizing this probing technique the investigator attempted to probe into responses and explore any arising inconsistencies in the data.

One disadvantage of the interview technique is the possibility of the interviewer biasing the interviewee's responses. The effect of the interviewer on the respondent verbally or by inferential gesture is an influence which can not be measured. These difficulties, however, can be overcome by following a schedule guide. Wrightstone et al (1956) point out that "another disadvantage of the interview technique is the time required which necessitates the selection of a small sample" (p. 155). The results can seldom be treated in a quantitative manner.

III. DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHECKLIST-QUESTIONNAIRE

Upon refining the problem to be investigated a checklist-questionnaire was selected as one method of collecting data. The checklist was developed from the one used by Hedges (1972). The researcher considered this checklist too broad and too lengthy. Furthermore, many of the tasks did not pertain to an E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. Assistance in constructing a checklist was found in the literature on task list and task descriptions (Rahmlow and Kiehn, 1967; Cox, 1969). As a result the functional approach was adopted whereby tasks were considered for their functions and were assigned to categories. The task category consisted of "combinations of commonly interrelated tasks" (Rahmlow and Kiehn, 1967, p. 6).

A total of fifty-two tasks concerning parental involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs were prepared by the investigator. The tasks were then categorized into four general areas: service, instructional support, decision-making and administrative. These tasks were taken to a number of knowledgeable persons in the field of Early Childhood Education. Among these were instructors at the University of Alberta in Elementary Education; Early Childhood Consultants for Early Childhood Services; Directors and Supervisors for Early Childhood both for the Department of Education and the Public School Board; Administrators; Kindergarten teachers; Parents and Graduate students. They were asked to judge the checklist-questionnaire according to the following criteria:

1) Is each task clear? If any are ambiguous, vague, redundant, overlong, can be misunderstood or have awkward wording, please revise.

2) Is each task necessary? If any are inappropriate, misleading, biased or loaded in one direction or unnecessary, please delete.

3) Add any other tasks you think necessary.

The judges were further asked if they agreed with the four categories chosen and the placement of each task in one of the categories.

In their selection and placement of tasks the judges felt that there was a need for a further category and the consensus was that a parent growth and development category be included. The investigator adopted the suggestion and devised a number of tasks for this category. The judges were again requested to select appropriate tasks for each of the five categories:

A. Service Category—function to involve tasks that directly assist the program in the performance of its instructional, decision-making and administrative activities.

B. Instructional Support Category—function to interact with children in a learning situation, normally within a classroom setting.

C. Decision-making Category—function to set and evaluate policy with regard to program, staff, budget, curriculum.

D. Administrative Category—function to institute and co-ordinate the functioning of the program.

E. Parent Growth and Development—function to familiarize parents with principles of child development.

The selected tasks were placed in a box and drawn at random.

Tasks appeared on the checklist-questionnaire in the order in which they were drawn from the box. The redeveloped checklist-questionnaire was then employed in a pilot study.

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Once the problem to be investigated had been refined and interviewing was selected as another method to collect data, work on the interview schedule was begun. In order to formulate the items in the interview schedule the researcher had to determine the objectives of the interview. The objectives of the interview relate to the research questions stated in Chapter one:

1. What does parent involvement mean to the respondent?
2. How do parents feel about parental involvement?
3. How are parents presently involved in the program?
4. How do parents desire to be involved in the program?
5. What are the parents' perceptions of the Local Advisory Committee?
6. How can parental involvement be improved?

A twelve item interview schedule was designed. Open-ended items were included in the interview schedule to allow probing of inconsistencies and to lessen misunderstandings and ambiguities. An attempt was also made to construct funnel-type sets of questions. According to Kerlinger (1964) "the funnel starts with a broad question and narrows down progressively to important specific point or points" (p. 471). Vocabulary was simplified to minimize language difficulties that might be experienced by the interviewees. A schedule guide was composed similar to that prepared by Hoke (1970, p. 112) to be read to each interviewee prior to the actual interview so that the respondent had a review of background information and information concerning the guidelines of the interview. It was assumed that any resulting interviewer bias would tend to be of the same nature for each interview.

The interview items and the schedule guide were judged by several knowledgeable persons at the University of Alberta to eliminate redundancy, awkward wording and to add any other items they deemed necessary.

V. OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ITEMS

The objective of item one was to put the respondent at ease and to encourage the respondents to relax and to express themselves freely. Furthermore item one served as a reliability check on the checklist-questionnaire on the assumption that any inconsistencies would appear.

Item two was designed to enable the interviewee to discuss something which he or she should have been familiar with, the program of the E.C.S. 'kindergarten,' and to ease any tension present in the initial stages of the interview.

Item three required the respondent to state his opinion as to what parental involvement means to the individual. The responses would constitute a definition of parental involvement and perhaps indicate the role of the parent in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program.

Items four to eight were included to solicit desirable and undesirable features with respect to parental involvement in the program.

Item nine was designed to ascertain how parents are presently involved in the program.

Item ten sought parents' opinions regarding their preferred or desired participation in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program.

Item eleven was designed to determine parents' perceptions of the Local Advisory Committee as to the necessity and usefulness of this committee in operating the program.

Item twelve sought parents' opinions and suggestions with respect to the need for improvement in the area of parental involvement in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs.

The statement of the items in the interview schedule can be found in Appendix B.

VI. PILOT STUDY

To validate the two survey instruments and to standardize procedures, a pilot study was carried out in an Edmonton Public school. On February 24, 1975 twenty-eight checklist-questionnaires with attached self-addressed stamped envelopes were given to the kindergarten teacher for distribution to each child. A day later seven parents, from this sample, were randomly selected—two L.A.C. and five non-L.A.C.—and contacted by telephone to request their co-operation in participating in an interview. Interviews were arranged at the parents' convenience and took place during the day or in the evenings. Suggestions regarding interviewing techniques in the University of Michigan Interviewer's Manual were followed in the seven pilot interviews. The researcher's interviewing technique was practised and refined. The telephone contact procedures were tested as were the use of the interview schedule and guide. These interviews were taped, transcribed verbatim and summarized. The investigator made every attempt to be consistent during the tryout of the interviews. Two graduate students judged the technique for inconsistencies and bias and determined any inadequacies in the instrument. As a result of the pilot study several revisions were made in the checklist-questionnaire, interview schedule and schedule guide.

VII. THE SAMPLE

The population for the investigation consisted of all the parents whose children attended a funded E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program in an Edmonton Public School during the 1974-75 school year. Following consultation with Mrs. Kay Chernowski, Supervisor of Early Childhood Education, Edmonton Public School Board, six participating schools were selected. Of the 342 checklist-questionnaires distributed, 194 replies were received in the mail. An analysis of the number and percentage of returns for each school is summarized in Table I. Obviously it would be impossible to include all the 342 parents in the interview sample. Certain delimitations were imposed including the willingness and availability of the respondents for the interview.

Names of parents were excluded from the sample for other

TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO THE CHECKLIST-QUESTIONNAIRE

School	Number in Total Population	Number of Responses	Percentage Response
Total	342	194	56.7
School A	48	26	54.2
School B	43	27	62.8
School C	43	28	65.1
School D	44	30	68.2
School E	68	33	48.5
School F	96	50	52.1

reasons. Parents of children who transferred into the school during the 1974-75 school year were excluded since they were not present when the program was initiated. Another delimitation was imposed in relation to the rearing of the child. Certain parents may not be able to express opinions concerning the program because of their infrequent contact with the child and their unfamiliarity with the activities of the program. These included parents who were not raising the child at the time of the investigation.

To obtain the sample to be interviewed a random selection of names was drawn from two boxes for each school area—two L.A.C.

parents from each school and five non-L.A.C. parents from each school comprising a total of forty-two parents interviewed—12 L.A.C. parents and 30 non-L.A.C. parents. Interviews were arranged at the parents' convenience and took place during the day or in the evenings. The subjects chosen to be interviewed were telephoned by the researcher to request their co-operation and to arrange a suitable date and time.

VIII. DATA COLLECTION

Shortly after permission to conduct this study was received from the Edmonton Public School Board, the principals of the six schools were contacted. The nature of the survey was explained and lists containing the names, addresses and telephone numbers of each parent whose child attended the particular E.C.S. 'kindergarten' were obtained.

Since the investigator was not interested in the identity of the individuals no attempt was made to identify each checklist-questionnaire. Three hundred and forty-two checklist-questionnaires with self-addressed, stamped envelopes were distributed by the 'kindergarten' teachers in the six schools on March 10, 1975. Replies began arriving within a few days. On hundred and ninety-four checklist-questionnaires were received.

Initial contact with the parents selected for interviewing was made by telephone to arrange a suitable date and time for an interview in their homes.

A definite procedure was defined and established with the subjects in their homes. The investigator presented each respondent a letter of introduction from the School Board (see Appendix C). Before the actual interview took place the interviewee received background information concerning the objectives of the study and the guidelines for the conducting of the interview (see Appendix B).

The interviews were taped on a Sony cassette tape recorder with an interior microphone as Hoke (1970) had found that "it seemed to be unobtrusive and non-threatening" (p. 37). Three or four interviews were conducted in a given day and verbatim transcriptions of the interviews were done by a hired typist so as to avoid any interviewer bias. A random sample of two transcripts per school area were judged for accuracy by two graduate students.

The 42 interviews were conducted between March 12, 1975 and March 27, 1975, approximately three weeks. Upon completing the interviews the investigator summarized the typed transcriptions to eliminate extraneous material such as pleasantries and asides. In instances where the interviewees gave opinions that could be included as information to other items this rearranging was completed to assist in analyzing the data. Furthermore, since the interview transcripts totalled over 200 pages, an attempt was made to consolidate the remarks of the parents and to quote them verbatim only where they appeared relevant.

A random selection of six summaries were judged for accuracy by two graduate students.

IX. SUMMARY

In this chapter procedural considerations relevant to this investigation were reported. The use of the two survey techniques, checklist-questionnaire and interview schedule, were described. The development of the instruments was detailed and the pilot study was described. The method that was used in delimiting the population was then outlined followed by a description of the procedure used in data collection. The following chapter presents results of the analysis of the data.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

I. PURPOSE OF THE CHAPTER

The purpose of this chapter is to present a detailed analysis of the data. Three different methods of analyzing the data are employed. In the section, Description of Responses to Checklist-Questionnaire Tasks, the raw scores were computed to percentage scores using a Texas Instrument 2550 calculator. The total population was divided into six groups according to the six schools sampled. Thus the six groups were: School A, School B, School C, School D, School E and School F. The totals for each of the three possible responses for present involvement and again for desired involvement—none, some, much—were computed as percentages of the total for each task, e.g., there were 26 respondents from School A; therefore for each task analyzed 26 respondents in School A equal 100%.

The second analysis is based on responses received from the 42 parents interviewed. In this section the 12 items posed in the interview schedule are dealt with individually. The data obtained from these interviews are reported in the section entitled Description of Responses to Interview Items.

The third analysis is based on some of the differences between the responses of L.A.C. and non-L.A.C. parents. These variations are reported in the section entitled Response Variations Between L.A.C. and Non-L.A.C. Parents.

II. DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSES TO CHECKLIST-QUESTIONNAIRE TASKS

In this section the 50 items or tasks posed in the checklist-questionnaire are grouped in the five categories, originally stated in Chapter III. Each task is discussed individually. Furthermore, each of the five categories is discussed as a component of parental involvement. In all cases responses are illustrated by tables.

Total Checklist-Questionnaire

Table II indicates that when all 50 tasks are considered less than 30% of all respondents are presently involved with the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program, only 4.2% presently have much involvement and 23.8% presently have some involvement. Further examination of Table II reveals that 54.0% of all respondents desire involvement, 7.5% desire much and 46.5% desire some.

Thirty-five point six per cent of the respondents in School E, the highest percentage of any school, are presently involved with the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. As a group the parents in School F had the lowest percentage of involvement, 18.3%. In only one school, School A, do less than 50% of the respondents desire involvement with these tasks.

Table II illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to the total checklist-questionnaire.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program, the majority desired this type of involvement.

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO THE TOTAL CHECKLIST

(50 Tasks)

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	4.2	23.8	71.9	7.5	46.5	46.0
School A (N=26)	5.2	21.2	73.5	7.5	40.5	52.0
School B (N=27)	2.0	31.0	67.0	4.1	48.0	47.9
School C (N=28)	4.3	21.6	74.1	6.6	45.4	48.0
School D (N=30)	4.1	30.9	65.0	4.8	51.6	43.6
School E (N=33)	7.7	27.9	64.4	15.6	47.3	37.1
School F (N=50)	2.7	15.6	81.7	6.2	45.7	48.1

Category One—Service Category

This category involves tasks that directly assist the program in the performance of its instructional, decision-making and administrative activities. The following 14 checklist-questionnaire items are involved in this category: 2, 4, 9, 11, 12, 14, 19, 23, 33, 34, 39, 46, 48 and 50.

According to Table III, 5.6% of all respondents presently have much involvement and 26.6% have some involvement, leaving 67.8% without any involvement. As is evident from Table III there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement.

Forty-nine per cent of the respondents in School D have no present involvement. This is the only school with over half the respondents presently involved with service tasks.

Table III illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Category One.

Although the majority of the respondents were not involved with service category tasks, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 2. Supervising bathroom breaks.

As is evident from Table IV, 84.5% of all respondents have no involvement in supervising bathroom breaks and 66.5% desire none. Only one-half of one per cent of all respondents are presently much involved with this task and only 2.1% desire much involvement. In 5 of the 6 schools none of the respondents are presently much involved with this task and in 4 of the 6 schools none of the respondents desire to be much involved.

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO SERVICE CATEGORY

(14 Tasks)

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	5.6	26.6	67.8	7.1	46.7	46.1
School A (N=26)	6.3	24.5	69.2	7.4	42.6	50.0
School B (N=27)	3.7	33.1	63.2	5.3	51.3	43.4
School C (N=28)	5.1	15.6	79.3	5.6	37.5	56.8
School D (N=30)	8.1	42.9	49.0	3.8	52.6	43.6
School E (N=33)	10.2	33.1	56.7	16.5	48.9	34.6
School F (N=50)	2.0	16.3	81.7	4.7	46.6	48.7

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 2

Supervising bathroom breaks

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	0.5	14.9	84.5	2.1	31.4	66.5
School A (N=26)	0.0	15.4	84.6	0.0	34.6	65.4
School B (N=27)	0.0	25.9	74.1	0.0	44.4	55.6
School C (N=28)	0.0	3.6	96.4	0.0	14.3	85.7
School D (N=30)	0.0	6.7	93.3	0.0	26.7	73.3
School E (N=33)	0.0	36.4	63.6	9.1	42.4	48.5
School F (N=50)	2.0	6.0	92.0	2.0	28.0	70.0

Table IV illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 2.

The majority of respondents were not involved with supervising bathroom breaks and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 4. Collecting 'junk' for classroom use, e.g., egg cartons, buttons.

As shown in Table V, 28.9% of all respondents presently have much involvement with collecting 'junk' for classroom use. Fifty-eight point eight per cent presently have some involvement, leaving only 12.4% without any involvement with this task. As is evident from Table V there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement with this task.

In none of the 6 schools do parents desire more involvement with this task than they presently have. School E had the highest percentage of respondents presently much involved, 48.5% and School F had the lowest percentage presently much employed, 14.0%.

Table V illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 4.

The majority of respondents were involved with collecting 'junk' for classroom use and also desired this type of involvement.

Task 9. Doing clerical work, e.g., typing, duplicating materials.

Ninety-one point eight per cent of all respondents presently have no involvement in doing clerical work (see Table VI). It is

TABLE V

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 4

—Collecting 'junk' for classroom use, e.g., egg cartons, buttons

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	28.9	58.8	12.4	28.9	55.1	16.0
School A (N=26)	34.6	53.8	11.5	30.8	57.7	11.5
School B (N=27)	22.2	59.3	18.5	29.6	48.1	22.2
School C (N=28)	32.1	60.7	7.1	32.1	60.7	7.1
School D (N=30)	30.0	63.3	6.7	20.0	60.0	20.0
School E (N=33)	48.5	42.4	9.1	42.4	42.4	15.1
School F (N=50)	14.0	68.0	18.0	22.0	60.0	18.0

TABLE VI

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 9

Doing clerical work, e.g., typing, duplicating materials

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents*	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.0	7.2	91.8	3.6	35.6	60.8
School A (N=26)	0.0	7.7	92.3	0.0	38.5	61.5
School B (N=27)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	29.6	70.4
School C (N=28)	3.6	3.6	92.9	0.0	21.4	78.6
School D (N=30)	3.3	16.7	80.0	3.3	43.3	53.3
School E (N=33)	0.0	12.1	87.9	15.1	33.3	51.5
School F (N=50)	0.0	4.0	96.0	2.0	42.0	56.0

noted, however, that almost 40.0% desire involvement with this task, 3.6% desire much and 35.6% desire none.

In 4 of the 6 schools none of the respondents are presently much involved with this task and in 3 of the 6 schools none of the respondents wish to be much involved. In School B none of the respondents are presently involved with doing clerical work.

Table VI illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 9.

The majority of respondents were not involved with doing clerical work and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 11. Preparing art and craft materials.

The data in Table VII indicate that 5.1% of all respondents presently have much involvement with preparing art and craft materials. Thirty-seven point one per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 57.7% without any involvement with this task. As is evident from Table VII there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement with this task.

In all but one of the schools, School C, the majority of respondents desire involvement with preparing art and craft materials.

Table VII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 11.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with preparing art and craft materials, the majority desired this type of involvement.

TABLE VII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 11

Preparing art and craft materials

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	5.1	37.1	57.7	7.2	57.7	35.0
School A (N=26)	7.7	42.3	40.0	11.5	61.5	26.9
School B (N=27)	0.0	66.7	33.3	3.7	66.7	29.6
School C (N=28)	3.6	7.1	89.3	7.1	39.3	53.6
School D (N=30)	20.0	53.3	26.7	3.3	70.0	26.7
School E (N=33)	3.0	54.5	42.4	21.2	57.6	21.2
School F (N=50)	0.0	14.0	86.0	0.0	54.0	46.0

Task 12. Sewing, e.g., costumes, curtains, puppets.

Table VIII indicates that 76.3% of all respondents presently have no involvement with the sewing task. It is noted, however, that almost 60% desire involvement with this task, 7.2% desire much and 51.5% desire some.

In 4 of the 6 schools none of the respondents are presently much involved with this task.

Table VIII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 12.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with the sewing task, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 14. Laminating parent and teacher made materials.

According to Table IX, 82.0% of all respondents presently have no involvement with laminating parent and teacher made materials, and 53.6% desire none. Only 1.0% of all respondents are presently much involved with this task and only 2.1% desire much involvement.

In 4 of the 6 schools none of the respondents are presently much involved with this task and in 3 of the 6 schools none of the respondents desire to be much involved.

Table IX illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 14.

The majority of respondents were not involved with laminating materials and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 19. Supervising crosswalks.

As is evident from Table X, 93.8% of all respondents presently

TABLE VIII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 12

Sewing, e.g., costumes, curtains, puppets

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	2.6	21.1	76.3	7.2	51.5	41.2
School A (N=26)	0.0	11.5	88.5	11.5	26.9	61.5
School B (N=27)	0.0	14.8	85.2	3.7	48.1	48.1
School C (N=28)	0.0	7.1	92.9	7.1	35.7	57.1
School D (N=30)	3.3	26.7	70.0	3.3	56.7	40.0
School E (N=33)	12.1	30.3	57.6	15.1	60.6	24.2
School F (N=50)	0.0	28.0	72.0	4.0	66.0	30.0

TABLE IX

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 14

Laminating parent and teacher made materials

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.0	17.0	82.0	2.1	44.3	53.6
School A (N=26)	0.0	19.2	80.8	3.8	42.3	53.8
School B (N=27)	0.0	14.8	85.2	0.0	44.4	55.6
School C (N=28)	0.0	3.6	96.4	0.0	32.1	67.9
School D (N=30)	3.3	23.3	73.3	0.0	40.0	60.0
School E (N=33)	3.0	24.2	72.7	6.1	54.5	39.4
School F (N=50)	0.0	16.0	84.0	2.0	36.0	62.0

TABLE X

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 19

Supervising crosswalks

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N-194)	2.1	4.1	93.8	3.6	29.4	67.0
School A (N=26)	0.0	0.0	100.0	3.8	15.4	80.8
School B (N=27)	0.0	11.1	88.9	0.0	44.4	55.6
School C (N=28)	0.0	3.6	96.4	0.0	21.4	78.6
School D (N=30)	0.0	3.3	96.7	0.0	20.0	80.0
School E (N=33)	3.0	6.1	90.9	3.0	36.4	60.6
School F (N=50)	6.0	2.0	92.0	10.0	34.0	56.0

have no involvement in supervising crosswalks, and 67.0% desire none. Only 2.1% of all respondents are presently much involved with this task and only 3.6% desire much involvement.

In 4 of the 6 schools none of the respondents are presently much involved with this task and in 3 of the 6 schools none of the respondents desire to be much involved. In none of the schools do the majority of respondents desire involvement in supervising crosswalks.

Table X illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 19.

The majority of respondents were not involved with supervising crosswalks and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 23. Helping to arrange and set out equipment and materials.

As shown in Table XI, 2.1% of all respondents presently have much involvement with helping to arrange and set out equipment and materials. Thirty-six point one per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 61.9% without any involvement with this task. As is evident from Table XI, there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement with this task.

In all 6 of the schools 50% or more of the respondents expressed a desire to be involved in helping to arrange and set out equipment and materials.

Table XI illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 23.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with

TABLE XI

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 23

Helping to arrange and set out equipment and materials

Respondents	Present Involvement Much	Present Involvement Some	Present Involvement None	Desired Involvement Much	Desired Involvement Some	Desired Involvement None
Total (N=194)	2.1	36.1	61.9	4.6	55.7	39.7
School A (N=26)	3.8	30.8	65.4	7.7	50.0	42.3
School B (N=27)	0.0	48.1	51.8	3.7	66.7	29.6
School C (N=28)	3.6	14.3	82.1	3.6	46.4	50.0
School D (N=30)	6.7	66.7	26.7	0.0	60.0	40.0
School E (N=33)	0.0	57.6	42.4	12.1	54.5	33.3
School F (N=50)	0.0	12.0	88.0	2.0	56.0	42.0

helping to arrange and set out equipment and materials, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 33. Serving on a telephone committee.

Seventy-four point four per cent of all respondents presently have no involvement in serving on a telephone committee and 48.4% desire none (see Table XII). It is noted that there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring much involvement with this task.

In half of the schools there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring much involvement in serving on a telephone committee.

Table XII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 33.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with serving on a telephone committee, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 34. Constructing tables, blocks, animal cages, etc., for classroom use.

The data in Table XIII indicate that 89.2% of all respondents presently have no involvement in constructing tables, blocks, animal cages, etc., for classroom use and 58.5% desire none. Only 0.5% of all respondents are presently much involved with this task and only 2.6% desire much involvement.

In 5 of the 6 schools none of the respondents are presently much involved with this task and in 2 of the 6 schools none of the

TABLE XII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 33

Serving on a telephone committee

Respondents	Present Involvement Much	Present Involvement Some	Present Involvement None	Desired Involvement Much	Desired Involvement Some	Desired Involvement None
Total (N=194)	8.2	17.0	74.7	7.7	43.8	48.4
School A (N=26)	15.4	11.5	73.1	7.7	38.5	53.8
School B (N=27)	11.1	11.1	77.8	3.7	44.4	51.8
School C (N=28)	10.7	14.3	75.0	7.1	46.4	46.4
School D (N=30)	3.3	30.0	66.7	6.7	46.7	46.7
School E (N=33)	9.1	6.1	84.8	12.1	51.5	36.4
School F (N=50)	4.0	24.0	72.0	8.0	38.0	54.0

TABLE XIII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 34

Constructing tables, blocks, animal cages, etc., for classroom use

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	0.5	10.3	89.2	2.6	38.7	58.8
School A (N=26)	0.0	3.8	96.1	0.0	19.2	80.8
School B (N=27)	0.0	3.7	96.3	7.4	40.7	51.8
School C (N=28)	0.0	3.6	96.4	3.6	25.0	71.4
School D (N=30)	0.0	36.7	63.3	0.0	46.7	53.3
School E (N=33)	0.0	9.1	90.9	3.0	48.5	48.5
School F (N=50)	2.0	6.0	92.0	2.0	44.0	54.0

respondents desired to be much involved.

Table XIII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 34.

The majority of respondents were not involved with constructing tables, blocks, animal cages, etc., for classroom use and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 39. Preparing snacks (juice and cookies).

Table XIV indicates that 11.3% of all respondents presently have much involvement with preparing snacks. Forty point seven per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 47.9% without any involvement with this task. As is evident from Table XIV, there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement with this task.

In 2 of the schools, Schools A and D, there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring much involvement with preparing snacks. In 2 of the schools, Schools B and E, there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring some involvement with this task. In 2 of the schools, Schools B and D, there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring no involvement with preparing snacks.

Table XIV illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 39.

The majority of respondents were involved with preparing snacks and also desired this type of involvement.

TABLE XIV

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 39

Preparing snacks (juice and cookies)

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	11.3	40.7	47.9	9.8	53.6	36.6
School A (N=26)	19.2	30.8	50.0	7.7	53.8	38.5
School B (N=27)	7.4	59.3	33.3	7.4	51.8	40.7
School C (N=28)	10.7	25.0	64.3	10.7	46.4	42.9
School D (N=30)	20.0	63.3	16.7	3.3	66.7	30.0
School E (N=33)	18.2	54.5	27.3	30.3	45.4	24.2
School F (N=50)	0.0	22.0	78.0	2.0	56.0	42.0

Task 46. Preparing materials for the children's program, e.g., charts, puzzles, games.

According to Table XV, 63.9% of all respondents presently have no involvement in preparing materials for the children's program. It is noted, however, that over 60% desire involvement with this task, 7.7% desire much and 54.1% desire some.

In School D there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring some involvement with preparing materials and also an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring no involvement with this task.

Table XV illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 46.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with the preparation of materials for the children's program, a majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 48. Helping children dress and undress (clothing, footwear) in the classroom.

As may be seen from Table XVI, 8.2% of all respondents presently have much involvement with helping children dress and undress (clothing, footwear) in the classroom. Thirty-eight point one per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 53.6% without any involvement with this task. It is noted that there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring much involvement with this task.

In Schools D and E there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring much involvement with dressing and undressing

TABLE XV

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 46

Preparing materials for the children's program, e.g., charts, puzzles, games

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	2.1	34.0	63.9	7.7	54.1	38.1
School A (N=26)	3.8	34.6	61.5	7.7	57.7	34.6
School B (N=27)	3.7	40.7	55.6	7.4	55.6	37.0
School C (N=28)	3.6	14.3	82.1	7.1	35.7	57.1
School D (N=30)	3.3	70.0	26.7	3.3	66.7	30.0
School E (N=33)	0.0	48.5	51.5	15.1	60.6	24.2
School F (N=50)	0.0	10.0	90.0	6.0	50.0	44.0

TABLE XVI

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 48

Helping children dress and undress (clothing, footwear) in the classroom

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	8.2	38.1	53.6	7.7	51.0	41.2
School A (N=26)	3.8	42.3	53.8	3.8	53.8	42.3
School B (N=27)	7.4	55.6	37.0	7.4	63.0	29.6
School C (N=28)	0.0	32.1	67.9	0.0	50.0	50.0
School D (N=30)	6.7	73.3	20.0	3.3	60.0	36.7
School E (N=33)	33.3	36.4	30.3	30.3	42.4	27.3
School F (N=50)	0.0	10.0	90.0	2.0	44.0	54.0

children. Also in School D there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring some involvement and also an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring no involvement with this task.

Table XVI illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 48.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with helping children dress and undress, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 50. Tidying and cleaning up the classroom.

As is evident from Table XVII, 4.6% of all respondents presently have much involvement with tidying and cleaning up in the classroom. Thirty-five point six per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 59.8% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table XVII reveals that there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement with this task.

In Schools C and D there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring much involvement with tidying and cleaning up the classroom. Also in School D there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring some involvement and also an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring no involvement with this task.

Table XVII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 50.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved in

TABLE XVII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 50

Tidying and cleaning up in the classroom

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	4.6	35.6	59.8	5.1	52.1	42.8
School A (N=26)	0.0	38.5	61.5	7.7	46.1	46.1
School B (N=27)	0.0	51.8	48.1	0.0	70.4	29.6
School C (N=28)	3.6	25.0	71.4	0.0	50.0	50.0
School D (N=30)	13.3	66.7	20.0	6.7	53.3	40.0
School E (N=33)	12.1	45.4	42.4	15.1	54.5	30.3
School F (N=50)	0.0	6.0	94.0	2.0	44.0	54.0

tidying and cleaning up in the classroom, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Category Two—Instructional Support Category

This category involves tasks in which parents interact with children in a learning situation, normally within a classroom setting. The following 11 checklist-questionnaire tasks are included in this category: 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 18, 24, 28, 29, 37 and 41.

As shown in Table XVIII, 4.1% of all respondents presently have much involvement and 29.6% have some involvement, leaving 66.3% without any involvement. There is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement.

In all 6 schools less than 50% of the respondents are presently involved with instructional support tasks. However, in all 6 schools more than 50% of the respondents expressed a desire to be involved with these tasks.

Table XVIII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Category Two.

Although the majority of the respondents were not involved with instructional support tasks, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 5. Supervising small group activities.

Three point one per cent of all respondents presently have much involvement with supervising small group activities (see Table XIX). Forty-seven point four per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 49.5% without any involvement with this task. It is

TABLE XVIII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT CATEGORY

(11 tasks)

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	4.1	29.6	66.3	8.9	53.1	38.0
School A (N=26)	4.2	28.3	67.5	7.3	45.1	47.5
School B (N=27)	2.0	45.4	52.5	5.7	54.9	39.4
School C (N=28)	1.6	28.2	70.1	4.9	59.7	35.4
School D (N=30)	2.7	31.5	65.7	4.8	58.2	37.0
School E (N=33)	10.2	37.7	52.1	17.4	56.2	26.4
School F (N=50)	3.4	15.8	80.7	10.4	47.4	42.2

TABLE XIX

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 5

Supervising small group activities

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	3.1	47.4	49.5	9.3	62.9	27.8
School A (N=26)	3.8	42.3	53.8	11.5	53.8	34.6
School B (N=27)	3.7	55.6	40.7	3.7	59.3	37.0
School C (N=28)	0.0	46.4	53.6	3.6	71.4	25.0
School D (N=30)	3.3	46.7	50.0	10.0	70.0	20.0
School E (N=33)	9.1	63.6	27.3	18.2	60.6	21.2
School F (N=50)	0.0	36.0	64.0	8.0	62.0	30.0

noted, also, that over 70% desire involvement with this task, 9.3% desire much and 62.9% desire some.

In 2 of the 6 schools, Schools B and E, more than 50% of the respondents are presently involved with supervising small group activities.

Table XIX illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 5.

The majority of respondents were involved with supervising small group activities and also desired this type of involvement.

Task 6. Responding to children's questions in the classroom.

The data in Table XX indicate that 61.9% of all respondents presently have no involvement with responding to children's questions in the classroom. It is noted, however, that over 60% desire involvement with this task, 10.3% desire much and 51.0% desire some.

In 3 of the 6 schools, Schools C, D and F, none of the respondents are presently much involved with this task.

Table XX illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 6.

Although a majority of respondents were not involved with responding to children's questions in the classroom, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 7. Leading small group discussions with children.

Table XXI indicates that 82.5% of all respondents presently have no involvement with leading small group discussions with

TABLE XX

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 6

Responding to children's questions in the classroom

Respondents	Present Involvement Much	Present Involvement Some	Present Involvement None	Desired Involvement Much	Desired Involvement Some	Desired Involvement None
Total (N=194)	3.6	34.5	61.9	10.3	51.0	38.7
School A (N=26)	7.7	42.3	50.0	11.5	53.8	34.6
School B (N=27)	3.7	51.8	44.4	11.1	55.6	33.3
School C (N=28)	0.0	32.1	67.9	0.0	60.7	39.3
School D (N=30)	0.0	43.3	56.7	10.0	43.3	46.7
School E (N=33)	12.1	57.6	30.3	24.2	57.6	18.2
School F (N=50)	0.0	2.0	98.0	6.0	42.0	52.0

TABLE XXI

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 7

Leading small group discussions with children

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.5	16.0	82.5	8.2	47.4	44.3
School A (N=26)	0.0	11.5	88.5	11.5	34.6	53.8
School B (N=27)	0.0	48.1	51.8	7.4	59.3	33.3
School C (N=28)	0.0	10.7	89.3	0.0	46.4	53.6
School D (N=30)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	56.7	43.3
School E (N=33)	9.1	30.3	60.6	21.2	54.5	24.2
School F (N=50)	0.0	4.0	96.0	8.0	38.0	54.0

children and 44.3% desire none. Only 1.5% of all respondents are presently much involved with this task and 8.2% desire much involvement.

In 5 of the 6 schools none of the respondents are presently much involved with this task and in 2 of the 6 schools none of the respondents desire to be much involved.

Table XXI illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 7.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with leading small group discussions with children, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 8. Supervising snacks (juice and cookies).

According to Table XXII, 8.2% of all respondents presently have much involvement with supervising snacks. Thirty-six point one per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 55.7% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table XXII reveals that there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement with this task.

Ninety-four per cent of the respondents in School F, the highest percentage of any school, presently have no involvement with supervising snacks. It is noted, however, that over half desire involvement with this task.

Table XXII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 8.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with supervising snacks, the majority desired this type of involvement.

TABLE XXII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 8

Supervising snacks (juice and cookies)

Respondents	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	8.2	36.1	55.7	9.8	49.5	40.7
School A (N=26)	15.4	42.3	42.3	7.7	46.1	46.1
School B (N=27)	0.0	59.3	40.7	0.0	59.3	40.7
School C (N=28)	3.6	21.4	75.0	3.6	39.3	57.1
School D (N=30)	13.3	53.3	33.3	6.7	56.7	36.7
School E (N=33)	21.2	54.5	24.2	30.3	54.5	15.1
School F (N=50)	0.0	6.0	94.0	8.0	44.0	48.0

Task 16. Working in an activity center with small groups of children.

As is evident from Table XXIII, 70.6% of all respondents presently have no involvement with working in an activity center with small groups of children. It is noted, however, that over 65% desire much and 58.8% desire some.

Ninety per cent of the respondents in School F, the highest percentage of any school, presently have no involvement with working in an activity center. Further examination of Table XXIII reveals that over half desire involvement with this task.

Table XXIII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task I6.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with working in an activity center, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 18. Talking to children about your work, hobbies, etc..

As shown in Table XXIV, 76.3% of all respondents presently have no involvement with talking to children about their work and hobbies and 39.2% desire none. Only 18.6% of all respondents are presently some involved with this task but 54.1% desire some involvement.

In Schools B and D none of the respondents are presently much involved with this task and in Schools A and B none of the respondents desire to be much involved.

Table XXIV illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of

TABLE XXIII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 16

Working in an activity center with small groups of children

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	2.1	27.3	70.6	7.2	58.8	34.0
School A (N=26)	0.0	23.1	76.9	7.7	53.8	38.5
School B (N=27)	3.7	66.7	29.6	11.1	59.3	29.6
School C (N=28)	0.0	17.9	82.1	0.0	71.4	28.6
School D (N=30)	0.0	26.7	73.3	6.7	53.3	40.0
School E (N=33)	6.1	36.4	57.6	15.1	63.6	21.2
School F (N=50)	2.0	8.0	90.0	4.0	54.0	42.0

TABLE XXIV

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 18

Talking to children about your work, hobbies, etc.

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	5.1	18.6	76.3	6.7	54.1	39.2
School A (N=26)	3.8	23.1	73.1	0.0	42.3	57.7
School B (N=27)	0.0	18.5	81.5	0.0	51.8	48.1
School C (N=28)	3.6	17.9	78.6	7.1	64.3	28.6
School D (N=30)	0.0	16.7	83.3	3.3	56.7	40.0
School E (N=33)	18.2	24.2	57.6	12.1	63.6	24.2
School F (N=50)	4.0	14.0	82.0	12.0	48.0	40.0

responses to Task 18.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with talking to children about their work and hobbies, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 24. Explaining to children reasons for observing class rules.

The data in Table XXV indicate that 4.6% of all respondents presently have much involvement with explaining to children reasons for observing class rules. Thirty-four per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 61.3% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table XXV reveals that over 60% of all respondents desire involvement with this task: 9.8% desire much and 51.0% desire some.

In only one of the 6 schools, School E, are 50% or more of the respondents presently involved with explaining to children reasons for observing class rules. In 3 schools, Schools A, B and D, none of the respondents are presently much involved with this task.

Table XXV illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 24.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with explaining to children reasons for observing class rules, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 28. Reading and/or telling stories to children.

Table XXVI indicates that 68.0% of all respondents presently

TABLE XXV

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 24

Explaining to children reasons for observing class rules

Respondents	Present Involvement Much	Present Involvement Some	Present Involvement None	Desired Involvement Much	Desired Involvement Some	Desired Involvement None
Total (N=194)	4.6	34.0	61.3	9.8	51.0	39.2
School A (N=26)	0.0	34.6	65.4	3.8	53.8	42.3
School B (N=27)	0.0	40.7	59.3	7.4	44.4	48.1
School C (N=28)	3.6	32.1	64.3	7.1	57.1	35.7
School D (N=30)	0.0	36.7	63.3	0.0	56.7	43.3
School E (N=33)	3.0	48.5	48.5	12.1	51.5	36.4
School F (N=50)	14.0	20.0	66.0	20.0	46.0	34.0

TABLE XXVI

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 28

Reading and/or telling stories to children

Respondents	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	4.6	27.3	68.0	10.8	53.1	36.1
School A (N=26)	7.7	26.9	65.4	11.5	38.5	50.0
School B (N=27)	11.1	55.6	33.3	11.1	59.3	29.6
School C (N=28)	0.0	25.0	75.0	10.7	64.3	25.0
School D (N=30)	0.0	13.3	86.7	3.3	53.3	43.3
School E (N=33)	3.0	30.3	66.7	12.1	63.6	24.2
School F (N=50)	6.0	20.0	74.0	14.0	44.0	42.0

have no involvement with reading or telling stories to children and 36.1% desire none. Only 4.6% of all respondents are presently much involved with this task and 10.8% desire much involvement.

Eighty-six point seven per cent of the respondents in School D, the highest percentage of any school, presently have no involvement with reading or telling stories to children. It is noted, however, that over 55% desire involvement with this task.

Table XXVI illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 28.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with reading or telling stories to children, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 29. Assisting with outdoor play activities.

According to Table XXVII, 76.3% of all respondents presently have no involvement with assisting outdoor play activities. It is noted, however, that about 65% desire involvement with this task, 6.7% desire much and 57.7% desire some.

In 5 of the 6 schools, A, B, C, D and E, none of the respondents are presently much involved in assisting with outdoor play activities. In all but one of the schools, School A, the majority of the respondents desire involvement with this task.

Table XXVII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 29.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with assisting with outdoor play activities, the majority desired this type of involvement.

TABLE XXVII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 29

Assisting with outdoor play activities

Respondents	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	0.5	23.2	76.3	6.7	57.7	35.6
School A (N=26)	0.0	19.2	80.8	3.8	42.3	53.8
School B (N=27)	0.0	33.3	66.7	3.7	63.0	33.3
School C (N=28)	0.0	28.6	71.4	7.1	71.4	21.4
School D (N=30)	0.0	36.7	63.3	3.3	70.0	26.7
School E (N=33)	0.0	15.1	84.8	12.1	48.5	39.4
School F (N=50)	2.0	14.0	84.0	8.0	54.0	38.0

Task 37. Assisting in music activities.

As is evident from Table XXVIII, 91.8% of all respondents presently have no involvement with assisting in music activities, and 62.4% desire none. Only 7.2% of all respondents are presently some involved with this task and 35.0% desire some involvement.

In 5 of the 6 schools, Schools A, B, C, D and E none of the respondents are presently much involved with assisting in music activities. None of the respondents in Schools C and D presently have any involvement with this task.

Table XXVIII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 37.

The majority of respondents were not involved with assisting in music activities and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 41. Assisting in the supervision of fieldtrips.

As shown in Table XXIX, 10.8% of all respondents presently have much involvement with assisting in the supervision of fieldtrips. Fifty-three point six per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 35.6% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table XXIX reveals that about 80% desire involvement with this task, 16.0% desire much and 63.4% desire some.

In only one of the schools, School A, are less than 50% of the respondents presently involved with assisting in the supervision of fieldtrips. In School C all respondents desire involvement with this task.

Table XXIX illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 41.

TABLE XXVIII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 37

Assisting in music activities

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.0	7.2	91.8	2.6	35.0	62.4
School A (N=26)	0.0	7.7	92.3	0.0	34.6	65.4
School B (N=27)	0.0	7.4	92.6	0.0	29.6	70.4
School C (N=28)	0.0	0.0	100.0	3.6	21.4	75.0
School D (N=30)	0.0	0.0	100.0	3.3	40.0	56.7
School E (N=33)	0.0	24.2	75.8	0.0	51.5	48.5
School F (N=50)	4.0	4.0	92.0	6.0	32.0	62.0

TABLE XXIX

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 41

Assisting in the supervision of fieldtrips

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	10.8	53.6	35.6	16.0	63.4	20.6
School A (N=26)	7.7	38.5	53.8	11.5	42.3	46.1
School B (N=27)	0.0	63.0	37.0	7.4	63.0	29.6
School C (N=28)	7.1	78.6	14.3	10.7	89.3	0.0
School D (N=30)	13.3	73.3	13.3	6.7	83.3	10.0
School E (N=33)	30.3	30.3	39.4	33.3	48.5	18.2
School F (N=50)	6.0	46.0	48.0	20.0	58.0	22.0

The majority of respondents were involved with assisting in the supervision of fieldtrips and also desired this type of involvement.

Category Three—Decision-Making Category

This category involves tasks that set and evaluate policy with regard to program, staff, budget and curriculum. The following 9 checklist-questionnaire tasks are included in this category: 3, 15, 22, 25, 27, 31, 35, 36 and 38.

The data in Table XXX indicate that 2.1% of all respondents presently have much involvement and 18.7% have some involvement, leaving 79.2% without any involvement. As is evident from Table XXX, there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement.

In all 6 of the schools less than 50% of the respondents are presently involved with decision-making tasks. However, in 3 schools, Schools C, D and E, more than 50% of the respondents expressed a desire to be involved with these tasks.

Table XXX illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Category Three.

Although the majority of the respondents were not involved with decision-making tasks, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 3. Selecting program personnel, e.g., teachers, teacher-aides.

Seventy-seven point three per cent of all respondents

TABLE XXX

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO DECISION-MAKING CATEGORY

(9 tasks)

Respondents	Present Involvement Much	 Some	 None	Desired Involvement Much	 Some	 None
Total (N=194)	2.1	18.7	79.2	4.8	47.0	48.3
School A (N=26)	3.8	13.2	82.9	6.4	35.9	57.7
School B (N=27)	0.4	22.2	77.4	2.1	44.0	53.9
School C (N=28)	3.2	26.2	70.6	5.5	56.0	38.5
School D (N=30)	2.2	24.8	73.0	3.3	57.8	38.9
School E (N=33)	3.0	20.9	76.1	10.8	45.1	44.1
School F (N=50)	0.7	10.4	88.9	1.8	44.0	54.2

presently have no involvement with selecting program personnel and 49.0% desire none (see Table XXXI). Only 3.1% of all respondents are presently much involved with this task and 8.8% desire much involvement.

One hundred per cent of the respondents in School F presently have no involvement with selecting program personnel. Over 80% of the respondents in School C, the highest percentage of any school, desire involvement with this task.

Table XXXI illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 3.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with selecting program personnel, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 15. Choosing material for the children's program.

The data in Table XXXII indicate that 1.0% of all respondents presently have much involvement with choosing material for the children's program. Twenty-one point one per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 77.8% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table XXXII reveals that about 55% desire involvement with this task, 6.2% desire much and 47.9% desire some.

In 4 of the 6 schools, Schools B, C, E and F, none of the respondents are presently much involved with this task.

Table XXXII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 15.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with

TABLE XXXI

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 3

Selecting program personnel, e.g., teachers, teacher-aids

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	3.1	19.6	77.3	8.8	42.3	49.0
School A (N=26)	3.8	7.7	88.5	7.7	34.6	57.7
School B (N=27)	0.0	18.5	81.5	0.0	37.0	63.0
School C (N=28)	7.1	46.4	46.4	17.9	64.3	17.9
School D (N=30)	6.7	33.3	60.0	10.0	53.3	36.7
School E (N=33)	3.0	24.2	72.7	15.1	36.4	48.5
School F (N=50)	0.0	0.0	100.0	4.0	34.0	62.0

TABLE XXXII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 15

Choosing materials for the children's program

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.0	[illegible]	77.8	6.2	47.9	45.9
School A (N=26)	3.8	11.5	84.6	11.5	46.1	42.3
School B (N=27)	0.0	22.2	77.8	7.4	40.7	51.8
School C (N=28)	0.0	32.1	67.9	3.6	53.6	42.9
School D (N=30)	3.3	30.0	66.7	3.3	40.0	56.7
School E (N=33)	0.0	18.2	81.8	9.1	57.6	33.3
School F (N=50)	0.0	16.0	84.0	4.0	48.0	48.0

choosing materials for the children's program, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 22. Assessing program needs.

Table XXXIII indicates that 69.1% of all respondents presently have no involvement with assessing program needs. It is noted, however, that over 60% desire involvement with this task, 4.1% desire much and 58.2% desire some.

In 3 of the 6 schools, Schools B, D and E, none of the respondents are presently much involved with assessing program needs. Eighty-four point six per cent of the respondents in School A, the highest percentage of any school, presently have no involvement with this task.

Table XXXIII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 22.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with assessing program needs, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 25. Choosing equipment for the children's program.

According to Table XXXIV, 83% of all respondents presently have no involvement with choosing equipment for the children's program and 51.0% desire none. Only 16.5% of all respondents are presently some involved with this task but 45.9% desire some involvement.

In 5 of the 6 schools, none of the respondents are presently much involved with choosing equipment. Ninety-nine point four per

TABLE XXXIII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 22

Assessing program needs

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.5	29.4	69.1	4.1	58.2	37.6
School A (N=26)	3.8	11.5	84.6	3.8	42.3	53.8
School B (N=27)	0.0	37.0	63.0	0.0	63.0	37.0
School C (N=28)	3.6	35.7	60.7	3.6	71.4	25.0
School D (N=30)	0.0	23.3	76.7	3.3	60.0	36.7
School E (N=33)	0.0	45.4	54.5	12.1	60.6	27.3
School F (N=50)	2.0	24.0	74.0	2.0	54.0	44.0

TABLE XXXIV

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 25

Choosing equipment for the children's program

Respondents	Present Involvement Much	Present Involvement Some	Present Involvement None	Desired Involvement Much	Desired Involvement Some	Desired Involvement None
Total (N=194)	0.5	16.5	83.0	3.1	45.9	51.0
School A (N=26)	0.0	23.1	76.9	0.0	34.6	65.4
School B (N=27)	0.0	22.2	77.8	3.7	40.7	55.6
School C (N=28)	3.6	0.0	96.4	3.6	50.0	46.4
School D (N=30)	0.0	26.7	73.3	0.0	56.7	43.3
School E (N=33)	0.0	18.2	81.8	9.1	48.5	42.4
School F (N=50)	0.0	12.0	88.0	2.0	44.0	54.0

cent of the respondents in School C, the highest percentage of any school, presently have no involvement with this task.

Table XXXIV illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 25.

The majority of the respondents were not involved with choosing equipment and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 27. Planning and organizing fieldtrips.

As is evident from Table XXXV, 5.7% of all respondents presently have much involvement with planning and organizing fieldtrips. Twenty-four point two per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 70.1% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table XXXV reveals that there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement with this task.

In all but one of the schools, School A, the majority of respondents desire involvement with planning and organizing fieldtrips.

Table XXXV illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 27.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with planning and organizing fieldtrips, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 31. Setting program goals and objectives.

As shown in Table XXXVI, 84.0% of all respondents presently have no involvement with setting program goals and objectives and 50.0% desire none. Only 2.1% of all respondents are presently much

TABLE XXXV

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 27

Planning and organizing fieldtrips

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	5.7	24.2	70.1	7.7	55.7	36.6
School A (N=26)	7.7	11.5	80.8	0.0	38.5	61.5
School B (N=27)	3.7	44.4	51.8	3.7	55.6	40.7
School C (N=28)	0.0	28.6	71.4	10.7	67.9	21.4
School D (N=30)	10.0	30.0	60.0	6.7	70.0	23.3
School E (N=33)	9.1	18.2	72.7	21.2	48.5	30.3
School F (N=50)	4.0	18.0	78.0	4.0	54.0	42.0

TABLE XXXVI

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 31

Setting program goals and objectives

Respondents	Present Involvement Much	Present Involvement Some	Present Involvement None	Desired Involvement Much	Desired Involvement Some	Desired Involvement None
Total (N=194)	2.1	13.9	84.0	5.7	44.3	50.0
School A (N=26)	3.8	19.2	76.9	11.5	30.8	57.7
School B (N=27)	0.0	14.8	85.2	0.0	40.7	59.3
School C (N=28)	10.7	17.9	71.4	10.7	42.9	46.4
School D (N=30)	0.0	20.0	80.0	3.3	60.0	36.7
School E (N=33)	0.0	21.2	78.8	12.1	36.4	51.5
School F (N=50)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	50.0

involved with this task and 5.7% desire much involvement.

In 4 of the 6 schools, Schools B, D, E and F, none of the respondents are presently much involved with setting program goals and objectives. One hundred per cent of the respondents in School F presently have no involvement with this task.

Table XXXVI illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 31.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with setting program goals and objectives, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 35. Planning the children's program.

The data in Table XXXVII indicate that 87.6% of all respondents presently have no involvement with planning the children's program and 54.6% desire none. Only 11.9% of all respondents are presently some involved with this task but 43.3% desire some involvement.

In 5 of the 6 schools none of the respondents are presently much involved with planning the children's program. It is noted that School D is the only school having a majority of respondents desiring involvement with this task.

Table XXXVII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 35.

The majority of the respondents were not involved with planning the children's program and also did not desire this type of involvement.

TABLE XXXVII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 35

Planning the children's program

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	0.5	11.9	87.6	2.1	43.3	54.6
School A (N=26)	3.8	3.8	92.3	11.5	30.8	57.7
School B (N=27)	0.0	14.8	85.2	0.0	48.1	51.8
School C (N=28)	0.0	21.4	78.6	0.0	39.3	60.7
School D (N=30)	0.0	16.7	83.3	0.0	60.0	40.0
School E (N=33)	0.0	12.1	87.9	3.0	42.4	54.5
School F (N=50)	0.0	6.0	94.0	0.0	40.0	60.0

Task 36. Preparing the program budget.

Table XXXVIII indicates that 86.1% of all respondents presently have no involvement with preparing the program budget and 66.5% desire none. Three point one per cent of all respondents are presently much involved with this task and only 1.5% desire much involvement.

In 3 of the 6 schools, Schools B, D and F, none of the respondents are presently much involved with preparing the program budget and in 5 schools, Schools A, B, C, D and F, none of the respondents desire to be much involved. One hundred per cent of the respondents in School B presently have no involvement with this task. In only one school, School D, do 50% or more of the respondents desire involvement with this task.

Table XXXVIII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 36.

The majority of respondents were not involved with preparing the program budget and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 38. Evaluating the objectives and goals of the children's program.

According to Table XXXIX, 77.8% of all respondents presently have no involvement with evaluating the objectives and goals of the children's program. It is noted, however, that over 55% desire involvement with this task, 3.6% desire much and 53.1% desire some.

In 4 of the 6 schools, Schools B, C, D and F, none of the respondents are presently much involved with evaluating the objectives and goals and in 2 schools, Schools C and F, none of the respondents

TABLE XXXVIII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 36

Preparing the program budget

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	3.1	10.8	86.1	1.5	32.0	66.5
School A (N=26)	3.8	19.2	76.9	0.0	26.9	73.1
School B (N=27)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	25.9	74.1
School C (N=28)	3.6	14.3	82.1	0.0	42.9	57.1
School D (N=30)	0.0	23.3	76.7	0.0	50.0	50.0
School E (N=33)	12.1	9.1	78.8	9.1	30.3	60.6
School F (N=50)	0.0	4.0	96.0	0.0	22.0	78.0

TABLE XXXIX

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 38

Evaluating the objectives and goals of the children's programs

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.0	21.1	77.8	3.6	53.1	43.3
School A (N=26)	3.8	11.5	84.6	11.5	38.5	50.0
School B (N=27)	0.0	25.9	75.1	3.7	44.4	51.8
School C (N=28)	0.0	39.3	60.7	0.0	71.4	28.6
School D (N=30)	0.0	20.0	80.0	3.3	70.0	26.7
School E (N=33)	3.0	21.2	75.8	6.1	45.4	48.5
School F (N=50)	0.0	14.0	86.0	0.0	50.0	50.0

desire to be much involved. Eighty-six per cent of the respondents in School F, the highest percentage of any school, presently have no involvement with this task.

Table XXXIX illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 38.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with evaluating the objectives and goals of the children's program, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Category Four—Administrative Category

This category involves tasks that institute and co-ordinate the functioning of the program. The following 10 checklist-questionnaire tasks are included in this category: 1, 10, 17, 20, 26, 30, 40, 42, 47 and 49.

As is evident from Table XL, 3.4% of all respondents presently have much involvement and 9.8% have some involvement, leaving 86.8% without any involvement. Further examination of Table XL reveals that there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement.

In all 6 of the schools less than 50.0% of the respondents are presently involved with administrative tasks. Further, in none of the schools do the majority of respondents desire involvement.

Table XL illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Category Four.

The majority of respondents were not involved with administrative tasks and also did not desire this type of involvement.

TABLE XL

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO ADMINISTRATIVE CATEGORY

(10 tasks)

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	3.4	9.8	86.8	5.6	33.7	60.7
School A (N=26)	4.2	11.6	84.2	5.0	30.8	64.2
School B (N=27)	0.7	9.6	89.6	1.1	33.7	65.2
School C (N=28)	3.6	5.7	90.7	5.4	24.3	70.4
School D (N=30)	3.0	12.3	84.7	3.7	34.7	61.7
School E (N=33)	4.5	9.7	85.8	11.8	35.8	52.4
School F (N=50)	3.8	9.8	86.4	5.6	38.6	55.8

Task 1. Completing the E.C.S. 'Kindergarten' application form.

As is shown in Table XLI, 69.6% of all respondents presently have no involvement with completing the E.C.S. 'Kindergarten' application forms and 44.8% desire none. Only 8.8% of all respondents are presently much involved with this task and 13.4% desire much involvement.

In all 6 of the schools less than 50% of the respondents are presently involved with completing the E.C.S. 'Kindergarten' application forms. In all but one school, School B, 50% or more of the respondents desire involvement with this task.

Table XLI illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 1.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with completing the E.C.S. 'Kindergarten' application forms, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 10. Interviewing program personnel, e.g., teachers, teacher-aides.

Ninety-three point eight per cent of all respondents presently have no involvement with interviewing program personnel and 65.5% desire none (see Table XLII). Only 5.7% of all respondents are presently some involved with this task but 30.4% desire some involvement.

In 5 of the 6 schools, none of the respondents are presently much involved with interviewing program personnel and in 2 schools, Schools B and F, none of the respondents desire to be much involved.

TABLE XLI

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 1

Completing the E. C. S. 'Kindergarten' application forms

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	8.8	21.6	69.6	13.4	41.7	44.8
School A (N=26)	15.4	23.1	61.5	11.5	42.3	46.1
School B (N=27)	3.7	33.3	63.0	0.0	48.1	51.8
School C (N=28)	14.3	14.3	71.4	14.3	35.7	50.0
School D (N=30)	3.3	20.0	76.7	16.7	40.0	43.3
School E (N=33)	6.1	21.2	72.7	21.2	36.4	42.4
School F (N=50)	10.0	20.0	70.0	14.0	46.0	40.0

TABLE XLII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 10

Interviewing program personnel, e.g., teachers, teacher-aides

Respondents	Present Involvement Much	Some	None	Desired Involvement Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	0.5	5.7	93.8	4.1	30.4	65.5
School A (N=26)	0.0	3.8	96.1	7.7	11.5	80.8
School B (N=27)	0.0	3.7	96.3	0.0	29.6	70.4
School C (N=28)	0.0	10.7	89.3	7.1	32.1	60.7
School D (N=30)	0.0	6.7	93.3	6.7	36.7	56.7
School E (N=33)	3.0	12.1	84.8	6.1	36.4	57.6
School F (N=50)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	32.0	68.0

One hundred per cent of the respondents in School F presently have no involvement with this task. Eighty point eight per cent of the respondents in School A, the highest percentage of any school, desire no involvement with this task.

Table XLII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 10.

The majority of respondents were not involved with interviewing program personnel and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 17. Serving on the Local Advisory Committee (L.A.C.).

The data in Table XLIII indicate that 12.4% of all respondents presently have much involvement with serving on the Local Advisory Committee. Only 9.8% presently have some involvement, leaving 77.8% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table XLIII reveals that while there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement with this task the percentage is still well under 50%.

In 5 of the 6 schools there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring much involvement in serving on the L.A.C.. In the other school, School F, there is no change, 8% are presently much involved with this task and 8% desire much involvement.

Table XLIII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 17.

The majority of respondents were not involved with serving on the L.A.C. and also did not desire this type of involvement.

TABLE XLIII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 17

Serving on the Local Advisory Committee (L.A.C.)

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	12.4	9.8	77.8	7.7	31.4	60.8
School A (N=26)	19.2	3.8	76.9	7.7	34.6	57.7
School B (N=27)	3.7	11.1	85.2	0.0	40.7	59.3
School C (N=28)	14.3	3.6	82.1	10.7	17.9	71.4
School D (N=30)	13.3	10.0	76.7	3.3	33.3	63.3
School E (N=33)	18.2	9.1	72.7	15.1	30.3	54.5
School F (N=50)	8.0	16.0	76.0	8.0	32.0	60.0

Task 20. Purchasing equipment for the children's program as ordered by the teacher.

Table XLIV indicates that 80.9% of all respondents presently have no involvement with purchasing equipment for the children's program and 54.1% desire none. Only 14.9% of all respondents are presently some involved with this task but 40.7% desire some involvement.

In Schools A, B and C none of the respondents are presently much involved with purchasing equipment and in School B none of the respondents desire to be much involved. Ninety-two point six per cent of the respondents in School B, the highest percentage of any school, presently have no involvement with this task.

Table XLIV illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 20.

The majority of respondents were not involved with purchasing equipment and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 26. Preparing a newsletter to keep parents informed.

According to Table XLV, 89.2% of all respondents presently have no involvement with preparing a newsletter and 62.4% desire none. Only 3.6% of all respondents are presently much involved with this task and 5.1% desire much involvement.

One hundred per cent of the respondents in School B presently have no involvement with preparing a newsletter. It is noted that School E is the only school having a majority of respondents desiring involvement with this task.

Table XLV illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of

TABLE XLIV

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 20

Purchasing equipment for the children's program as ordered by the teacher

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	4.1	14.9	80.9	5.1	40.7	54.1
School A (N=26)	0.0	15.4	84.6	3.8	30.8	65.4
School B (N=27)	0.0	7.4	92.6	0.0	37.0	63.0
School C (N=28)	0.0	3.6	96.4	3.6	28.6	67.9
School D (N=30)	3.3	23.3	73.3	3.3	46.7	50.0
School E (N=33)	9.1	21.2	69.7	12.1	45.4	42.4
School F (N=50)	8.0	16.0	76.0	6.0	48.0	46.0

TABLE XLV

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 26

Preparing a newsletter to keep parents informed

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	3.6	7.2	89.2	5.1	32.5	62.4
School A (N=26)	0.0	7.7	[illegible].3	0.0	26.9	73.1
School B (N=27)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	37.0	63.0
School C (N=28)	7.1	7.1	85.7	0.0	28.6	71.4
School D (N=30)	3.3	23.3	73.3	3.3	36.7	60.0
School E (N=33)	0.0	3.0	97.0	18.2	33.3	48.5
School F (N=50)	8.0	4.0	88.0	6.0	32.0	62.0

responses to Task 26.

The majority of respondents were not involved with preparing a newsletter and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 30. Organizing fund raising events, e.g., raffles, tea and bake sales.

As is evident from Table XLVI, 91.2% of all respondents presently have no involvement in organizing fund raising events and 60.3% desire none. None of the respondents are presently much involved with this task and only 7.2% desire much involvement.

One hundred per cent of the respondents in Schools C and D presently have no involvement with organizing fund raising events. In Schools B and D none of the respondents desire to be much involved with this task. In only one school, School F, do more than 50% of the respondents desire involvement with this task.

Table XLVI illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 30.

The majority of respondents were not involved with organizing fund raising events and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 40. Securing cost estimates for supplies and equipment for the children's program.

As shown in Table XLVII, only 1.5% of all respondents presently have much involvement with securing cost estimates for supplies and equipment. Seven point two per cent presently have some involvement leaving 91.2% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table XLVII reveals that while there is an increase

TABLE XLVI

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 30

Organizing fund raising events, e.g., raffles, tea and bake sales

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	0.0	8.8	91.2	7.2	32.5	60.3
School A (N=26)	0.0	23.1	76.9	7.7	42.3	50.0
School B (N=27)	0.0	7.4	92.6	0.0	40.7	59.3
School C (N=28)	0.0	0.0	100.0	3.6	21.4	75.0
School D (N=30)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	6.7	93.3
School E (N=33)	0.0	3.0	97.0	15.1	27.3	57.6
School F (N=50)	0.0	16.0	84.0	12.0	48.0	40.0

TABLE XLVII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 40

Securing cost estimates for supplies and equipment for the children's program

Respondents	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.5	7.2	91.2	3.1	30.4	66.5
School A (N=26)	0.0	15.4	84.6	0.0	30.8	69.2
School B (N=27)	0.0	3.7	96.3	0.0	25.9	74.1
School C (N=28)	0.0	7.1	92.9	3.6	17.9	78.6
School D (N=30)	3.3	10.0	86.7	3.3	33.3	63.3
School E (N=33)	6.1	0.0	93.9	9.1	39.4	51.5
School F (N=50)	0.0	8.0	92.0	2.0	32.0	66.0

in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement with this task the percentage is still well under 50%.

Ninety-six point three per cent of the respondents in School B, the highest percentage of any school, presently have no involvement with securing cost estimates. In none of the schools do the majority of respondents desire involvement.

Table XLVII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 40.

The majority of respondents were not involved with securing cost estimates for supplies and equipment and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 42. Organizing the duty roster.

Only 1.0% of all respondents presently have much involvement with organizing the duty roster (see Table XLVIII). Three point six per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 95.4% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table XLVIII reveals that less than 30% of all respondents desire involvement with this task, 2.6% desire much and 25.3% desire some.

In Schools B, C, D and F none of the respondents are presently much involved with organizing the duty roster and in Schools D and F none of the respondents desire to be much involved. One hundred per cent of the respondents in School F have no involvement with this task. In none of the schools do the majority of respondents desire involvement.

Table XLVIII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 42.

TABLE XLVIII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 42

Organizing the duty roster

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.0	3.6	95.4	2.6	25.3	72.2
School A (N=26)	3.8	3.8	92.3	3.8	30.8	65.4
School B (N=27)	0.0	3.7	96.3	3.7	18.5	77.8
School C (N=28)	0.0	7.1	92.9	3.6	17.9	78.6
School D (N=30)	0.0	10.0	90.0	0.0	26.7	73.3
School E (N=33)	3.0	0.0	97.0	6.1	30.3	63.6
School F (N=50)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	26.0	74.0

The majority of respondents were not involved with organizing the duty roster and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 47. Organizing a parent study group.

Table XLIX indicates that only 1.0% of all respondents presently have much involvement with organizing a parent study group. Seven point seven per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 91.2% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table XLIX indicates that while there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement with this task the percentage is still well under 50%.

One hundred per cent of the respondents in Schools C and D presently have no involvement with organizing a parent study group. In only one school, School E, do the majority of respondents desire involvement with this task.

Table XLIX illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 47.

The majority of respondents were not involved with organizing a parent study group and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Task 49. Purchasing materials for the children's program.

According to Table L, only 1.0% of all respondents presently have much involvement with purchasing materials for the children's program. Eleven point three per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 87.6% without any involvement with this task. Further

TABLE XLIX

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 47

Organizing a parent study group

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.0	7.7	91.2	4.6	36.6	58.8
School A (N=26)	3.8	7.7	88.5	3.8	30.8	65.4
School B (N=27)	0.0	18.5	81.5	3.7	40.7	55.6
School C (N=28)	0.0	0.0	100.0	7.1	14.3	78.6
School D (N=30)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
School E (N=33)	0.0	12.1	87.9	9.1	42.4	48.5
School F (N=50)	2.0	8.0	90.0	4.0	44.0	52.0

TABLE L

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 49

Purchasing materials for the children's program

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.0	11.3	87.6	3.1	35.6	61.3
School A (N=26)	0.0	11.5	88.5	3.8	26.9	69.2
School B (N=27)	0.0	7.4	92.6	3.7	18.5	77.8
School C (N=28)	0.0	3.6	96.4	0.0	28.6	71.4
School D (N=30)	3.3	20.0	76.7	0.0	46.7	53.3
School E (N=33)	0.0	15.1	84.8	6.1	36.4	57.6
School F (N=50)	2.0	10.0	88.0	4.0	46.0	50.0

examination of Table L reveals that less than 40% of all respondents desire involvement with this task.

In Schools A, B, C and E none of the respondents are presently much involved with purchasing materials and in Schools C and D none of the respondents desire to be much involved. Ninety-six point four per cent of the respondents in School C, the highest percentage of any school, presently have no involvement with this task. In none of the schools do the majority of respondents desire involvement.

Table L illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 49.

The majority of respondents were not involved with purchasing materials for the children's program and also did not desire this type of involvement.

Category Five—Parent Growth and Development Category

This category involves tasks that familiarize parents with the principles of child development. The following 6 checklist-questionnaire tasks are included in this category: 13, 21, 32, 43, 44 and 45.

As is evident from Table LI, 5.9% of all respondents presently have much involvement and 37.9% have some involvement, leaving 56.2% without any involvement. Further examination of Table LI reveals that there is an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement.

In 2 schools, Schools B and C, a majority of the respondents are presently involved with parent growth and development tasks.

TABLE LI

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO PARENT GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT CATEGORY

(6 tasks)

Respondents	Present Involvement Much	Some	None	Desired Involvement Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	5.9	37.9	56.2	13.2	54.3	32.5
School A (N=26)	8.3	28.8	62.8	13.5	50.6	35.9
School B (N=27)	2.5	48.1	49.4	6.2	57.4	36.4
School C (N=28)	10.1	43.5	46.4	15.5	57.1	27.4
School D (N=30)	2.2	41.7	56.1	11.1	56.1	32.8
School E (N=33)	9.6	38.9	51.5	23.7	50.0	26.3
School F (N=50)	4.0	31.0	65.0	10.0	54.7	35.3

However, in all 6 schools well over 50% of the respondents expressed a desire to be involved with these tasks.

Table LI illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Category Five.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with parent growth and development tasks, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 13. Participating in study-group sessions on child development, nutrition, language development, etc..

As shown in Table LII, 65.5% of all respondents presently have no involvement with participating in study group sessions It is noted, however, that about 65% desire involvement with this task, 14.9% desire much and 50.0% desire some.

Seventy-five per cent of the respondents in School C, the highest percentage of any school, presently have no involvement with participating in study-group sessions. In all 6 schools well over 50% of the respondents expressed a desire to be involved with this task.

Table LII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 13.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with participating in study-group sessions, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 21. Reading articles or books on child development.

The data in Table LIII indicate that 11.9% of all respondents

TABLE LII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 13

Participating in study-group sessions on child development, nutrition, language development, etc.

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	5.7	28.9	65.5	14.9	50.0	35.0
School A (N=26)	15.4	15.4	69.2	15.4	50.0	34.6
School B (N=27)	0.0	37.0	63.0	3.7	59.3	37.0
School C (N=28)	3.6	21.4	75.0	21.4	42.9	35.7
School D (N=30)	0.0	30.0	70.0	10.0	53.3	36.7
School E (N=33)	15.1	27.3	57.6	30.3	42.4	27.3
School F (N=50)	2.0	36.0	62.0	10.0	52.0	38.0

TABLE LIII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 21

Reading articles or books on child development

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	11.9	57.7	30.4	23.7	55.1	21.1
School A (N=26)	19.2	46.1	34.6	30.8	53.8	15.4
School B (N=27)	3.7	77.8	18.5	7.4	66.7	25.9
School C (N=28)	21.4	67.9	10.7	17.9	67.9	14.3
School D (N=30)	0.0	56.7	43.3	16.7	66.7	16.7
School E (N=33)	15.1	54.5	30.3	36.4	42.4	21.2
School F (N=50)	12.0	50.0	38.0	28.0	44.0	28.0

presently have much involvement with reading articles or books on child development. Fifty-seven point seven per cent presently have some involvement, leaving only 30.4% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table LIII reveals that about 80% of all respondents desire involvement with this task, 23.7% desire much and 55.1% desire some. It is noted that there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring some involvement with this task.

In Schools B and C there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring involvement with this task.

Table LIII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 21.

The majority of respondents were involved with reading articles or books on child development and also desired this type of involvement.

Task 32. Observing children in a 'kindergarten' classroom.

Table LIV indicates that almost 70% of all respondents are presently involved with observing children in the 'kindergarten' classroom, 10.8% presently have much involvement and 57.2% presently have some involvement. Further examination of Table LIV reveals that over 80% of all respondents desire involvement with this task, 17.5% desire much and 63.9% desire some.

Ninety-six point five per cent of the respondents in School C, the highest percentage of any school, are presently involved in observing children in the classroom. In Schools B, C and E there is

TABLE LIV

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 32

Observing children in a 'Kindergarten' classroom

Respondents	Present Involvement Much	Present Involvement Some	Present Involvement None	Desired Involvement Much	Desired Involvement Some	Desired Involvement None
Total (N=194)	10.8	57.2	32.0	17.5	63.9	18.6
School A (N=26)	7.7	53.8	38.5	15.4	57.7	26.9
School B (N=27)	3.7	70.4	25.9	7.4	66.7	25.9
School C (N=28)	28.6	67.9	3.6	35.7	60.7	3.6
School D (N=30)	13.3	73.3	13.3	13.3	73.3	13.3
School E (N=33)	18.2	63.6	18.2	27.3	60.6	12.1
School F (N=50)	0.0	32.0	68.0	10.0	64.0	26.0

a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring much involvement.

Table LIV illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of respondents to Task 32.

The majority of respondents were involved with observing children in a 'kindergarten' classroom and also desired this type of involvement.

Task 43. Viewing films, slides, etc., in the parent program.

According to Table LV 88.7% of all respondents presently have no involvement in viewing films and slides in the parent program and 49.5% desire none. Only 1.5% of all respondents are presently much involved with this task and 4.1% desire much involvement.

One hundred per cent of the respondents in School D presently have no involvement with viewing films and slides in the parent program. In 3 of the schools, Schools B, E and F, the majority of respondents desire involvement with this task.

Table LV illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 43.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with viewing films and slides for the parent program, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 44. Participating in workshops and leadership training sessions.

As is evident from Table LVI, only one per cent of all respondents presently have much involvement with participating in

TABLE LV

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 43

Viewing films, slides, etc., in the parent program

Respondents	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.5	9.8	88.7	4.1	46.4	49.5
School A (N=26)	0.0	3.8	96.1	3.8	38.5	57.7
School B (N=27)	3.7	22.2	74.1	7.4	48.1	44.4
School C (N=28)	0.0	3.6	96.4	3.6	42.9	53.6
School D (N=30)	0.0	0.0	100.0	3.3	36.7	60.0
School E (N=33)	0.0	12.1	87.9	3.0	54.5	42.4
School F (N=50)	4.0	14.0	82.0	4.0	52.0	44.0

TABLE LVI

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 44

Participating in workshops and leadership training sessions

	Present Involvement			Desired Involvement		
Respondents	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	1.0	17.5	81.4	4.1	46.9	49.0
School A (N=26)	3.8	15.4	80.8	7.7	42.3	50.0
School B (N=27)	0.0	22.2	77.8	0.0	40.7	59.3
School C (N=28)	0.0	21.4	78.6	0.0	50.0	50.0
School D (N=30)	0.0	26.7	73.3	6.7	43.3	50.0
School E (N=33)	0.0	18.2	81.8	12.1	51.5	36.4
School F (N=50)	2.0	8.0	90.0	0.0	50.0	50.0

workshops and leadership training sessions. Seventeen point five per cent presently have some involvement, leaving 81.4% without any involvement with this task. Further examination of Table LVI reveals that over 50% of all respondents desire involvement with this task, 4.1% desire much and 46.9% desire some.

In 4 schools, Schools B, C, D and E, none of the respondents are presently much involved with participating in workshops and leadership training sessions and in 3 schools, Schools B, C and F, none of the respondents desire to be much involved. In only one school, School E, do more than 50% of the respondents desire involvement with this task.

Table LVI illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 44.

Although the majority of respondents were not involved with participating in workshops and leadership training sessions, the majority desired this type of involvement.

Task 45. Discussing the children's program with the teacher, nurse, counsellor, etc..

Over 60% of all respondents are presently involved with discussing the children's program with the teacher, nurse, or counsellor, 4.6% presently have much involvement and 56.2% presently have some involvement (see Table LVII). It is noted that almost 80% of all respondents desire involvement with this task, 14.9% desire much and 63.4% desire some.

Eighty-five point seven per cent of the respondents in School C, the highest percentage of any school, are presently

TABLE LVII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES TO TASK 45

Discussing the children's program with the teacher, nurse, counsellor, etc.

Respondents	Present involvement			Desired Involvement		
	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
Total (N=194)	4.6	56.2	39.2	14.9	63.4	21.6
School A (N=26)	3.8	38.5	57.7	7.7	61.5	30.8
School B (N=27)	3.7	59.3	37.0	11.1	63.0	25.9
School C (N=28)	7.1	78.6	14.3	14.3	78.6	7.1
School D (N=30)	0.0	63.3	36.7	16.7	63.3	20.0
School E (N=33)	9.1	57.6	33.3	33.3	48.5	18.2
School F (N=50)	4.0	46.0	50.0	8.0	66.0	26.0

involved with discussing the children's program with the teacher, nurse or counsellor. In School E there is a decrease in the percentage of respondents desiring some involvement and an increase in the percentage of respondents desiring much involvement.

Table LVII illustrates the complete percentage breakdown of responses to Task 45.

The majority of respondents were involved with discussing the children's program with the teacher, nurse or counsellor and also desired this type of involvement.

Summary of Results of Checklist-Questionnaire Tasks

The findings from the checklist-questionnaire show that of the 50 tasks analyzed, for 25 of them, or 50%, the majority of the parents are presently not involved but desire involvement. For 18 of the 50 tasks analyzed, or 36%, the majority of the parents are presently not involved and desire not to be involved. For the remaining 7 tasks analyzed, or 14%, the majority of the parents are presently involved and desire involvement. For no tasks was it found that the majority are presently involved but desire no involvement.

When analyzed in the categories, it was found that for four of the five categories, the majority of the parents are presently not involved but desire involvement. For the fifth category, the Administrative Category, it was found that the majority are not involved and they do not desire involvement.

When the 50 tasks are analyzed as a total checklist it is revealed that the majority of the parents are presently not involved but desire involvement. For a summary of the findings of the checklist-questionnaire see Table LVIII.

III. DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW ITEMS

In this section the 12 items posed in the interviews are stated and discussed individually. Parental opinions and comments pertaining to each item are reported. The direct quotations are taken from actual transcriptions. They were selected as representative of the responses to the items. In some instances, responses to interview items are illustrated by tables.

Item 1. Would you like to make any comments concerning the checklist-questionnaire?

The majority of the 42 interviewees felt that the checklist-questionnaire was relatively simple to complete, easily understood and that it included most of the tasks that parents are performing in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs. Only 4 of the respondents found the checklist somewhat repetitive. The majority claimed that the checklist-questionnaire took only 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

Item 2. Your child attends an E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program? What can you tell me about this program?

The majority of the parents interviewed expressed the opinion that the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program is a good program and that their child received benefits from the program which they could not obtain elsewhere. Several benefits were described: 24 parents indicated that they were pleased with the program because

TABLE LVIII

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF CHECKLIST-QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Majority parents presently involved and desire involvement.

Category 1	Task 4 - Collecting 'junk.' Task 39 - Preparing snacks.
Category 2	Task 5 - Supervising small group activities. Task 41 - Assisting in the supervision of fieldtrips.
Category 3	Task 21 - Reading articles/books on child development. Task 32 - Observing children. Task 45 - Discussing the children's program.

II. Majority parents presently involved but do not desire involvement.

NIL

III. Majority parents presently not involved and do not desire involvement.

Category 1	Task 2 - Supervising bathroom breaks. Task 9 - Doing clerical work. Task 14 - Laminating materials. Task 19 - Supervising crosswalks. Task 34 - Constructing tables, blocks.
Category 2	Task 37 - Assisting in music activities.
Category 3	Task 25 - Choosing equipment. Task 35 - Planning the children's program. Task 36 - Preparing the budget.
	Administrative Category:
Category 4	Task 10 - Interviewing program personnel. Task 17 - Serving on the L.A.C.. Task 20 - Purchasing equipment. Task 26 - Preparing a newsletter. Task 30 - Organizing fund raising events. Task 40 - Securing cost estimates for supplies, etc. Task 42 - Organizing the duty roster. Task 47 - Organizing parent study groups. Task 49 - Purchasing materials.

TABLE LVIII (Continued).

IV. Majority parents presently not involved but desire involvement.

Total Checklist.

Service Category:

Category 1
- Task 11 - Preparing art and craft materials.
- Task 12 - Sewing.
- Task 23 - Helping to arrange materials and equipment.
- Task 33 - Serving on a telephone committee.
- Task 46 - Preparing materials.
- Task 48 - Helping children dress and undress.
- Task 50 - Tidying and cleaning up.

Instructional Support Category:

Category 2
- Task 6 - Responding to children's questions.
- Task 7 - Leading small group discussions.
- Task 8 - Supervising snacks.
- Task 16 - Working in an activity center.
- Task 18 - Talking to children about work, etc.
- Task 24 - Explaining to children class rules.
- Task 28 - Reading/telling stories.
- Task 29 - Assisting with outdoor play activities.

Decision-Making Category:

Category 3
- Task 3 - Selecting program personnel.
- Task 15 - Choosing materials.
- Task 22 - Assessing program needs.
- Task 27 - Planning and organizing fieldtrips.
- Task 31 - Setting program goals and objectives.
- Task 38 - Evaluating objectives of the children's program.

Category 4
- Task 1 - Completing the E.C.S. 'K' application forms.

Parent Growth and Development Category:

Category 5
- Task 13 - Participating in study-group sessions.
- Task 43 - Viewing films, slides.
- Task 44 - Participating in workshops.

it gave their child the opportunity to associate with other children. Another desirable feature of the program to which 23 parents referred was that the program allows for parental input and involvement. In addition, 16 parents were pleased with the developmental approach of the children's program. Fourteen of the respondents felt that the program provides children with many varied experiences such as fieldtrips, activity centers, free play and arts and crafts. Thirteen of the parents interviewed felt that an excellent feature of the program was that it attempted to deal with the total child in that social and emotional needs of the child are met. Other positive features of the program include: teacher's approach to the program, frequent change of activities to keep children's interest, the child has a chance to be creative and it's a preparation for grade one. Most of the respondents made such statements as:

> I think the unique thing is the attempt to deal with the whole child, not just the academic type of program.
>
> They do a lot of stuff. They get involved in a lot of different things and I really think it's worthwhile.
>
> The kindergarten is excellent. I am very pleased with the program.

One other parent reported:

> One thing that makes me glad my child is in the program is that they are in kindergarten and yet still have full privileges of the school such as health nurse, library, gym and music room.

Although the majority of parents expressed favorable reactions to the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program, there were 3 negative comments voiced. One parent felt there should be "more academic learning than what E.C.S. allows." A second respondent voiced the opinion that the program should be more organized and structured rather than just a "free whatever they want to do kind of thing." Another reiterated that the program was "more like a play school for four year olds."

Item 3. The E.C.S. philosophy is that parents should be involved in the 'kindergarten' program. What do you understand parental involvement to mean?

In analyzing the responses to Item 3 it was found that there was little consensus concerning a definition of parental involvement. Most parents found the term to be "too broad to define because it involves so many different things." Many respondents clarified parental involvement as being dependent upon individual parental choice or upon one's skills, abilities and available time.

Several parents from each school stated opinions similar to the following:

> It is difficult to define parental involvement . . . unless to draw up a list of tasks that could be included because parents are different and not all parents want to be involved in the school. That is not to say that they are not involved with their children. It's a very personal kind of thing.

Other typical comments follow:

> . . . can be a very broad range, it can mean someone sitting at home telephoning other parents to someone else being actively involved in the kindergarten classroom.
>
> I really don't know what they mean by parental involvement other than they always try and get everyone out to meetings and out to help . . . . other than that I don't know what is expected of parents.

In their attempt to define parental involvement many respondents mentioned several descriptive features several times. The frequency of these features of parental involvement are tabulated and reported in Table LIX. Ten respondents, or 23.8%, were unable to state what parental involvement means to them.

Item 4. What do you like most about parental involvement?

As indicated in Table LX, 37 of the 42 parents interviewed indicated a positive response to this item. However, 2 parents stated that they did not know what they liked about parental involvement because "I don't go" and 3 respondents claimed that there was nothing about parental involvement that they liked:

> That's hard to say because there isn't too much.
>
> I can't say that I like anything about parental involvement.

In responding to this item the response of most parents centered around their desire to have an interest in and to be aware of what their child is doing in the program.

> It gives you a chance to be with them and to know how they are progressing, how they are learning.
>
> . . . the opportunity to see what your child is doing in the classroom—seeing their reactions, that is, seeing something before the fact, instead of after the fact.
>
> I like the way my children respond to me when I am involved. They know that I am interested and that I care . . . It's a closeness that I feel.

Fourteen others indicated that what they liked about the program was the opportunity to assist the children and the teacher

TABLE LIX

ANALYSIS OF RESPONDENTS DESCRIPTION TO THE DEFINITION OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

Item	Description	Frequency
1.	Assisting the teacher when she requests help.	55
2.	Having an interest in and knowledge and awareness of what my child is doing in the classroom.	48
3.	Helping my child at home with the things he's doing at school.	27
4.	Having an input into the goals of the program.	24
5.	Assisting with fieldtrips.	20
6.	Visiting and observing in the classroom.	11
7.	Taking my turn on the duty roster.	8
8.	Participating on the L.A.C.	6
9.	Attending parent education workshops.	6
10.	Attending monthly meetings.	5
11.	Meeting other parents.	2
12.	Purchasing materials.	1
	Total	213

TABLE LX

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ITEM 4

What do you like most about parental involvement?

Item	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Having an interest in and knowledge and awareness of what my child is doing in the classroom.	26	61.9
2.	Helping children in the classroom	14	33.3
3.	Having an input into the goals of the program.	13	30.9
4.	Meeting other parents.	8	19.0
5.	Having a sense of belonging, being a part of things.	5	11.9
6.	Feeling that it gives the child.	4	9.5
7.	Personal growth.	3	7.1
8.	Assisting with fieldtrips.	3	7.1
9.	Nothing.	3	7.1
10.	Don't know.	2	4.8
11.	Getting to know the teacher better.	1	2.4

in the classroom. Thirteen respondents emphasized the importance to them of having the opportunity to share ideas with the teacher and the school and thus have an input into the goals of the program. Other responses are quoted below:

> The sense of being part of things. I don't have the experience of being shut out.
>
> I enjoy having some input and having it listened to.
>
> It's been a good learning experience for me.

The complete results of Interview Schedule Item 4 are summarized in Table LX.

Item 5. What do you like least about parental involvement?

As shown in Table LXI, 13 parents, or 31.0%, claimed that there was nothing about parental involvement that they did not like. A further 6 interviewees, or 14.3%, responded with such answers as:

> I don't know if I would like to comment on that question.
>
> I really couldn't say what I like least.
>
> I have no comment to make on that question.

Most of the remaining 23 respondents (54.8%) indicated several aspects of parental involvement that they did not like. The two most frequent criticisms of parental involvement expressed by the respondents concerned the difficulty of getting other parents involved in the program and their feeling that they were forced or

TABLE LXI

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ITEM 5

What do you like least about parental involvement?

Item	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Nothing.	13	31.0
2.	Don't know.	6	14.3
3.	Getting other parents involved.	6	14.3
4.	Forced involvement.	6	14.3
5.	Other parents and their ideas.	5	11.9
6.	Menial involvement.	5	11.9
7.	Babysitter problem.	3	7.1
8.	Completion of forms.	3	7.1
9.	Lack of communication between E.C.S. and School Board.	2	4.8
10.	Meetings.	2	4.8
11.	Not enough direction.	1	2.4
12.	Teacher and principal problem.	1	2.4
13.	Lack of involvement by other agencies.	1	2.4

coerced into being involved. One respondent rather aptly summed up these feelings when she stated:

> What I don't like about parental involvement is that you are made to feel like a 'schnook' if you don't become involved and some parents just don't want to do this.

These problems are discussed in greater depth under Interview Schedule Item 6.

Certain parents claimed that they were dissatisfied with parental involvement because of suggestions and ideas expressed by other parents:

> The degree to which some people in the community talk about how they want parental involvement.

Some respondents complained of the menial types of tasks that they were asked to perform such as cutting paper, gluing squares and triangles, tying shoelaces and painting classrooms. They expressed the feeling of being "joe-boys" or "just glorified labor"—"of being used."

The complete results of Interview Schedule Item 5 are summarized in Table LXI.

A comparison of the total frequency of comments about the positive features of parental involvement (Table LX) with the total frequency of comments about the negative features of parental involvement (Table LXI) indicates that there were over twice as many responses concerning the positive features.

Item 6. Some people feel that all parents should be involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. Other people feel that only those who want to be involved should be. How do you personally feel about this?

The reasons the 26 respondents gave for stating the opinion that only parents that want to be involved should be centered around the idea that each parent should have the right to make this decision.

> It's up to each parent to decide their involvement.
>
> Every parent has the right to choose . . .
>
> . . . an individual thing.
>
> There should be no obligation for me to get involved.

The majority of these 26 respondents were also of the opinion that parental involvement is different for different people and is dependent upon the individual's skills, abilities and time.

> Parental involvement is very different for everyone. The individual should choose the input he wants. Some parents are very involved with their children at home but are not involved in the program. This does not mean that they are not involved. It is not the quantity but the quality that is important. Parents who do not want to be involved or who do not have the time to be involved should not have parental involvement imposed upon them.

Several parents were of the opinion that if parental involvement were forced upon people resentment between the home and the school might be built up. Others felt that parents having a negative attitude toward involvement in the program would do more harm than good. Several opinions were stated:

> It seems that in any situation, community, school, or whatever, that just a few people care enough to become involved . . . It's always going to be the ones that are most concerned that seem to get involved.
>
> . . . all parents in even the most minute ways can be involved. All parents can at least be interested.

Sixteen parents, or 38.1%, claimed that all parents should be involved in one way or another. The majority of these respondents felt that it is the responsibility of all parents to be involved in the program for the benefit of their child and that all parents could do some small thing. Some respondents expressed feelings of anger and hostility toward parents who were not involved. Some comments were:

> . . . makes me very mad when parents send their kids and expect the rest of us to do all the work.
>
> Parents who don't get involved shouldn't have the right to send their kids.

The complete results of Interview Schedule Item 6 are summarized in Table LXII.

Item 7. What is your opinion about the involvement of fathers in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program?

Should fathers be involved?

The subjects were unanimously in favor of the idea of fathers being involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. It was the feeling of most respondents that the child loses out if his father is not interested or involved in the program. Nevertheless, many of the subjects realized that due to societal restrictions and pressures,

TABLE LXII

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ITEM 6

Some people feel that all parents should be involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. Other people feel that only those who want to be involved should be. How do you personally feel about this?

Item	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Only parents that want to be involved should be.	26	61.9
2.	All parents should be involved.	16	38.1
	Total	42	100.0

it is not always feasible for fathers to become involved. Several comments on this topic follow:

> Fathers should be just as involved as mothers, but practically that is just not possible the way we live in our society.
>
> Our present society doesn't present the opportunities for fathers to be involved but maybe this will change.

Are fathers involved in the program your child attends?

Eighteen of the respondents, or 42.9%, stated that fathers are involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program that their child attends. Twenty-four of the respondents, or 57.1%, claimed that no fathers are involved in their child's program. One of the respondents in her attempt to explain the lack of involvement on the part of fathers stated:

> . . . fathers don't think this is their territory so they don't become involved.

Are any fathers on the L.A.C.?

Nine of the respondents, or 21.4%, stated that fathers are involved on the L.A.C.. The remaining 33 respondents, or 78.6%, claimed that they were not aware of any fathers being involved on the L.A.C..

In what ways might fathers become more involved in the program?

General indications by the parents were that fathers could become more involved in their child's 'kindergarten' program in many different ways: attending meetings, taking part in workshops, constructing tables and blocks, puppet theatres, painting chairs, and tables, talking to children about their work and hobbies, repairing toys and equipment and going on fieldtrips. Seven respondents, or 16.7%, stated that they didn't know how fathers could become more involved.

The complete results of Interview Schedule Item 7 are summarized in Table LXIII.

This question revealed little information probably because it was difficult for the respondents to suggest different ways in which fathers could be involved since most of the program's activities are held during the day while the fathers are occupied at work.

Item 8. Parents must be involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program before government funding is granted. How do you feel about this?

Twenty-seven, or 64.3% of the respondents interviewed, strongly emphasized that government funding should not be based on parental involvement. The majority of these respondents claimed that E.C.S. is an educational program and that it should not be conditional upon the involvement of parents. Many were of the opinion that parents should be encouraged to become involved but not forced because of funding. Several comments on this topic follow:

> . . . government should not withhold financing because of lack of parental involvement . . . its more important that children have a kindergarten experience than to have parent involvement.
>
> . . . as far as I am concerned kindergarten is part of your education and the government should

TABLE LXIII

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ITEM 7

In what ways might fathers become more involved in the program?

Item	Response	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Attending meetings and workshops.	19	45.2
2.	Constructing tables, blocks, etc.	9	21.4
3.	Showing more interest in the program.	9	21.4
4.	Talking to children about work or hobbies.	8	19.0
5.	Repairing toys or equipment.	8	19.0
6.	Serving on the L.A.C.	7	16.7
7.	Assisting with fieldtrips.	7	16.7
8.	Don't know.	7	16.7

> subsidize it regardless whether the parents are involved or not.
>
> I object to the application for kindergarten being made conditional on the involvement of parents . . . that's politics . . . that's not getting the best for our children . . . I resent that statement.

Feelings of anger were expressed by others:

> I resent like hell being told I have to get involved or there will be no money for kindergarten.

Eleven, or 26.2%, indicated that this condition forces parents to make an effort on behalf of their children and that it is beneficial for the parents, too. One response was ". . . the government is forcing parent involvement because of the children." Another respondent stated:

> . . . if you have to put yourself out a bit you'll treat it a bit better than a lot of people treat the schools.

Other comments follow:

> . . . in a way it's good because it forces people to get out to participate in the kindergarten.
>
> . . . because it does help the children if the parents do become involved.

The remaining 4, or 9.5% of the subjects, expressed the opinion that they were not aware that parental involvement was necessary in order to receive the funds for the program. Comments such as the following were indicative of this group's lack of knowledge concerning the funding of E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs:

> . . . I didn't know that the government based the kindergarten grant on parental involvement.
>
> . . . government funding? I didn't know that! Why do they do that?

Should government have the right to legislate parent involvement?

In response to this item, 32, or 76.2% of the respondents, stated negative reactions. Most of these respondents felt that if parent involvement was mandatory then parents would become resistant to the whole concept of parental involvement. Other opinions concerning this matter were:

> . . . don't want any government to legislate that I have to be involved.
>
> . . . after all the government is the people so we should have some say about parental involvement.
>
> . . . even though parents are involved they are having negative reactions and none of the positive reactions.

Ten, or 23.8% of the respondents, gave an affirmative response when asked if government should have the right to legislate parental involvement. Most of the respondents in this group felt that the legislation of parent involvement is beneficial in that it guarantees parents the right to become involved. The following comments summarize these opinions:

> . . . government is guaranteeing parents the right to get involved.
>
> . . . yes, government should legislate involvement—I wish they wouldn't stop at kindergarten. I wish they would enforce it right through school because this is why the kids are straying away.
>
> I see it as a right that parents can be involved and I'm concerned that enough parents assert this right or we'll lose it.

Item 9. Have you been involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program during the past 6 months?

An examination of the response to this item indicated that of the 42 subjects interviewed only 2, or 4.8%, had no involvement in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program within the past six months. The 2 respondents that had not participated in the program gave the following reasons:

> . . . haven't been asked to be involved.
>
> . . . don't go because it's not my place; it's the teacher's place.

In analyzing the different types of involvement as stated by the respondents it was found that the parents were involved in the program in a variety of ways: assisting in the classroom; fieldtrips; L.A.C.; attending meetings concerning the program; preparing materials; and so forth.

As shown in Table LXIV, 39 of the 42 parents interviewed, or 92.8%, stated "assisting in the classroom" as one of the 3 tasks in which they are presently involved. Twenty-six respondents, or 62.0%, presently have involvement with fieldtrips and 21 parents, or 50.5%, have been involved during the past six months with attending meetings.

The complete results of Interview Schedule Item 9 are illustrated in Table LXIV.

This item revealed little information other than that contained in Table LXIV probably because of the specificity of the item which of necessity pins down each respondent to state a response which fits into the categories of analysis.

TABLE LXIV

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ITEM 9

Name the three tasks in which you were most involved?

Item	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Assisting in the classroom.	39	92.8
2.	Assisting on fieldtrips.	26	62.0
3.	Attending meetings.	21	50.0
4.	Serving on the L.A.C.	13	31.0
5.	Preparing materials.	7	16.6
6.	Baking goodies for parties.	4	9.5
7.	Talking to parents and teachers.	3	7.1
8.	Preparing nutritional snacks.	2	4.7
9.	Collecting 'junk' for classroom use.	2	4.7
10.	Purchasing supplies.	1	2.4
11.	Preparing newsletters.	1	2.4
12.	Telephoning parents.	1	2.4
13.	Budget	1	2.4

Item 10. Would you have preferred to be involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program during the past 6 months in a different way than you were?

An examination of the responses to this item revealed that of the 42 parents interviewed only 4, or 9.5%, expressed the opinion that they would prefer to have been involved in a different way. These 4 respondents indicated that they would prefer to have been involved in the following areas: assisting in the classroom; helping with fieldtrips; and, serving on the L.A.C..

Two respondents, or 4.8%, indicated that they had no desire for any further involvement. The reasons given were as follows:

> . . . I don't feel comfortable in being involved.
>
> . . . parents do not belong in the classroom at any time.

Thirty-six, or 85.7%, of the respondents were satisfied with their present involvement. Some of their comments were:

> . . . no different involvement wanted.
>
> . . . parents should be involved in the things that are important and meaningful to them.
>
> . . . enjoyed what I've done.

Item 11. Some parents are involved on the Local Advisory Committee (L.A.C.). Are you familiar with the L.A.C.?

Twenty-six of the 42 parents interviewed, or 61.9%, claimed that they were familiar with the L.A.C.. The remaining 16, or 38.1% of the respondents, indicated that they were aware of the existence of this particular committee but had no knowledge of its function.

Please describe briefly the work of this committee.

The responses given for describing the work of the L.A.C. were varied. Nevertheless a number of functions mentioned were similar in nature. These were as follows: completing forms and setting goals for the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program; organizing monthly meetings and parent education workshops; establishing various committees such as telephone, duty roster, nutrition, etc.; setting policies and bylaws.

As is evident from Table LXV, 23 of the 42 parents interviewed, or 54.8%, stated that the work of the L.A.C. included the completion of the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' application forms. Twenty-one, or 50.0% of the respondents, claimed that the committee was responsible for organizing monthly meetings.

The complete results of Interview Schedule Item 11 are summarized in Table LXV.

In your opinion is it a useful committee?

Twenty-two, or 52.4% of the 42 parents interviewed, were of the opinion that the L.A.C. was useful because according to E.C.S. guidelines, a committee must be established if government funding is to be granted. Many of these respondents were of the opinion that the committee assisted in making parents more aware of what was occurring in the program. Several parents felt that the L.A.C. gave parents the opportunity to work closely with the teacher. Others felt that the committee had its usefulness in that it helped to bridge the gap between the home and the school.

Four, or 9.5% of the respondents, indicated that the L.A.C.

TABLE LXV

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ITEM 11

Please describe briefly the work of this committee?

Item	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Completing the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' forms.	23	54.8
2.	Organizing monthly meetings.	21	50.0
3.	Organizing committees.	21	50.0
4.	Don't know.	16	38.1
5.	Acting as a liaison between school and parents.	9	21.4
6.	Organizing parent education workshops.	8	19.0
7.	Collecting funds/handling budget.	6	14.3
8.	Interviewing/selecting teacher, teacher-aide.	6	14.3
9.	Determining goals for the E.C.S. program.	5	11.9
10.	Purchasing materials.	5	11.9
11.	Consulting with E.C.S. and School Board.	4	9.5
12.	Setting policies and bylaws.	3	7.1

had no place in the program, that it was unnecessary. Negative comments such as "parents are frustrated" and "all parents do is bicker among themselves" were indicative of this group's feelings.

The remaining 16, or 38.1% of the respondents, were uncertain as to the usefulness of the L.A.C. since the majority of these respondents claimed that they had no knowledge of the function of this committee.

In your opinion is it a successful committee?

In response to this probe 23, or 54.8% of the respondents, voiced an affirmative response. The L.A.C. in their opinion was effective because they were successful in their attempt to obtain governmental funding for the program. There were several other opinions stated by satisfied respondents:

> . . . the committee got a teacher aide for us.
>
> They're trying to get all the parents involved.
>
> . . . the goals of the program are being met.

However 17, or 40.5% of the subjects interviewed, could not comment on the successfulness of the committee since they were unfamiliar with the function of this committee. One subject felt that the L.A.C. was very time consuming and with this point of view it was difficult for her to evaluate the success of the committee.

Two, or 4.8% of the respondents, indicated a negative response to this item. One respondent was of the opinion that the L.A.C.'s activities should be the responsibility of the teacher and the school.

The other felt that the committee was futile in that: "all they do is talk about the same thing over and over—getting more parents involved."

What is the extent of the committee's authority? Advisory? Decision-Making?

Most of the respondents were uncertain as to the extent of authority of the L.A.C.. Some felt that the committee had extensive authority in the area of implementing the 'kindergarten' program, in determining the goals of the program and in selecting and hiring the teachers. Others felt that there was a dichotomy between the authority that the committee has and the authority that it is supposed to have. A few respondents were of the opinion that the authority of the committee is limited by the teacher and the administration of the school. Others felt that the authority of the L.A.C. was dependent upon a majority vote of all parents with children in the program.

How many persons are on the L.A.C.? How many of these are parents? Who else?

Responses to this item were varied. Most thought that the L.A.C. consisted of 6 to 10 members although one respondent thought the committee might have as many as 15 members. Ten parents could not react to this question.

Most respondents were of the opinion that parents compose the majority of the L.A.C.. A few of the parents in some of the schools stated that they thought certain community agencies were represented on the L.A.C.. The agencies mentioned most frequently were: Preventive Social Services, Culture, Youth and Recreation and Health and Social Services.

How were they selected?

Eighteen of the 42 parents interviewed stated that the L.A.C. members were volunteers. Several people in each school made a comment similar to the following:

> . . . strictly volunteers . . . at the registration meeting in spring parents were told that if they didn't volunteer they wouldn't have a kindergarten—so they volunteered.

Another typical comment was:

> . . . either they got a gentle nudge at the meeting last June—like a kick in the rear like I did—or they put up their hands and volunteered.

Eight parents thought the L.A.C. members were selected by nomination and election. Sixteen parents, or 38.1%, did not know how the L.A.C. members were chosen.

Item 12. In what ways do you feel that the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program that your child attends could be most improved, particularly in the area of parental involvement?

Fifteen, or 35.7% of the respondents, stated that they did not know how the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program could be improved. Some of these respondents replied that they were satisfied with the status quo, others just had no suggestions to offer.

The remaining 27 parents suggested numerous ways that parental involvement could be improved. The majority of these respondents were of the opinion that teachers and administrators must be willing to accept parents in the program. Obviously many parents felt that this was not now the case. Two comments which qualified this opinion were:

> It is a very different kind of program with parental involvement and this is seen as threatening by some people in the established system.
>
> If parents are to be involved at all then you better, on the other hand, have teachers and administrators who are totally with parental involvement—not just verbally but they must live it and feel it.

Other respondents claimed that more parents should be encouraged to become involved and gave the following suggestions:

> . . . should have a television program to encourage parental involvement.
>
> I think you can get a lot of parents involved by catching their interest on television.

Nine respondents were of the opinion that greater communication between the home and the school is needed. Some typical comments were:

> . . . basic problem is communication between teacher and principal and the parents.
>
> Parents don't know about E.C.S.. I don't know if its the fault of the school or the school board or E.C.S. for this lack of information.
>
> . . . program could be improved by more communication, more telephoning, more newsletters . . .

Others stated the opinion that only parents that want to be involved should be and that each parent should have the right to make this decision.

> Only parents who want to have an input should have to.
>
> Parents must be able to choose their own involvement—much, some or none.

The results of Interview Schedule Item 12 are summarized in Table LXVI.

IV. RESPONSE VARIATIONS BETWEEN L.A.C. AND NON-L.A.C. PARENTS

The data were analyzed to determine if any relationships exist between the L.A.C. parents and the non-L.A.C. parents interviewed as to their attitudes and opinions concerning parental involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs. Most variations noted between L.A.C. parents and non-L.A.C. parents were minor. The reasons for the variations were not clear in all cases.

Most of the L.A.C. respondents stated that they were satisfied with the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program as it is presently operated. On the other hand 3 non-L.A.C. parents were of the opinion that the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs should be more structured, more academic and less play oriented. These 3 respondents claimed that the program was "more like a playschool for four year olds."

In examining responses to Interview Item 3 it was found that the L.A.C. parents had less difficulty than the non-L.A.C. parents in attempting to define parent involvement. Most non-L.A.C. parents could not define the term whereas most L.A.C. parents gave one or

TABLE LXVI

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ITEM 12

In what ways do you feel that the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program that your child attends could be most improved particularly in the area of parental involvement?

Item	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Don't know.	15	35.7
2.	Greater acceptance of parents by teachers and administrators.	11	26.2
3.	Encouraging more parental involvement.	10	23.8
4.	More communication.	9	21.4
5.	Parent involvement for only those who desire it.	4	9.5
6.	More involvement of fathers.	3	7.1
7.	More parent education workshops.	1	2.4
8.	More fieldtrips.	1	2.4
9.	Establishing library of parent readings.	1	2.4
10.	More academic learning in the children's program.	1	2.4
11.	Compulsory parent involvement or no involvement at all.	1	2.4

more descriptive features in their attempt to define parental involvement. Responses such as "I don't know" and "difficult thing to come up with" were very prevalent in the non-L.A.C. group.

Many of the L.A.C. parents emphasized a strong dislike to the number of E.C.S. 'kindergarten' forms that the government required as they found these "too time consuming and ridiculous." They also expressed displeasure with "other parents who would not participate." The majority of non-L.A.C. parents were of the opinion that there was "nothing that I don't like about parent involvement."

In examining Interview Schedule Item 6 an interesting difference between these two groups of parents is evident. The majority of the non-L.A.C. parents were of the opinion that "only those parents who want to be involved should be" whereas most of the L.A.C. parents expressed the opinion that all parents should be involved in the program in some way whether it be in the home or at school.

The majority of the L.A.C. parents view parental involvement as a right that E.C.S. is guaranteeing the parents in the 'kindergarten' program. They felt that this right would be lost if all parents did not take advantage of the opportunities to be involved in the program. Most non-L.A.C. parents expressed the opinion that parent involvement was an individual matter. They also stated that they felt children should not be deprived of a 'kindergarten' experience because of their parents' lack of involvement.

The variation found in Interview Schedule Items 9 and 10 was most interesting. L.A.C. parents presently serving on this committee stated that they desired less of this type of involvement whereas the non-L.A.C. parents desired some type of involvement on the L.A.C..

The majority of L.A.C. parents had some knowledge of the committee, its purpose and function in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. They were of the opinion that the L.A.C. was effective. Most non-L.A.C. parents, were not familiar with this committee, its purpose or function, other than through monthly meetings and were uncertain as to its effectiveness.

No revealing variations between L.A.C. and non-L.A.C. parents were found in Interview Schedule Items 4, 7 and 12.

A summary of the report, conclusions of the findings, some recommendations for further research and implications will be found in the final chapter of this report.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

I. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes and opinions held by parents concerning their involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs with respect to the following research questions:

1. What does parent involvement mean to the respondent?
2. How do parents feel about parent involvement?
3. How are parents presently involved in the program?
4. How do parents desire to be involved in the program?
5. What are the parents' perceptions of the L.A.C.?
6. How can parental involvement be improved?

In Chapter II research reports related to the study and a description of the Alberta Scene were presented.

Chapter III reported the procedural considerations relevant to this study. The population for the investigation consisted of all parents whose children attended a funded E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program in an Edmonton Public School during the 1974-75 school year. From this population 6 participating schools were selected. All the parents, whose children attended the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program in these schools, were requested to complete the checklist-questionnaire and thus constituted the subjects for the study. The size of the sample was 342. From this sample a randomly selected number of 42 parents—7 from each school; 2 L.A.C. parents, 5 non-L.A.C. parents—were interviewed for the study.

In Chapter IV the data were analyzed in terms of responses to the checklist-questionnaire tasks and the interview schedule items and in terms of the response variations between L.A.C. and non-L.A.C. parents.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The major findings and conclusions of this investigation are discussed as they relate to each of the research questions posed in the first chapter. These questions are restated and a summary of parental opinions pertaining to each question are reported and discussed.

What does parental involvement mean to the respondent?

All parents found the term, parent involvement, to be extremely difficult to define. Interview Schedule Item 3 yielded the following information:

1. There was little consensus of opinion concerning a working definition of this term.
2. In their attempt to define parental involvement, most parents mentioned one or more descriptive features, e.g., assisting with fieldtrips, attending meetings.
3. The descriptive feature mentioned most often was "assisting the teacher when she requests help."
4. Approximately 25% of the subjects were unable to state

what parent involvement means to them.

How do parents feel about parental involvement?

Interview Schedule Items 4 to 8 yielded the following information:

1. When asked: What do you like most about parent involvement? slightly over 60% of the subjects' responses centered around their desire to have an interest in and to be aware of what their child is doing in the classroom. In addition a third of the parents indicated that what they like about parent involvement was the opportunity to assist the teacher and the children in the classroom.
2. When asked: What do you like least about parent involvement? almost half of the subjects claimed either that they did not know or that there was nothing about parent involvement that they did not like.
3. Over 60% of the subjects were of the opinion that only parents that want to be involved should be and that each parent should have the right to make this decision.
4. No subject was opposed to the involvement of fathers in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program.
5. Slightly over 40% of the subjects stated that fathers are involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program that their child attends.
6. Slightly over 20% of the subjects stated that fathers are involved on the L.A.C.
7. Two thirds of the subjects were of the opinion that

government funding should not be based on parental involvement.

8. Over three quarters of the subjects were of the opinion that the government should not have the right to legislate parental involvement.

How are parents presently involved in the program?

The checklist-questionnaire yielded the following information:

1. For 43 of the 50 tasks in the checklist the majority of respondents are presently not involved.
2. When analyzed in the categories, it was found that for all five categories: service, instructional support, decision-making, administrative and parent growth and development, the majority of parents are presently not involved.
3. The task "collecting 'junk' for classroom use" yielded the largest percentage of parents involved (87.7%). The task, "reading articles or books on child development" yielded the second largest percentage of parents involved (69.6%). The tasks that yielded the next largest percentages of parents involved were:
    "Observing children in a classroom" (68.0%).
    "Assisting in the supervision of fieldtrips" (64.4%).
    "Discussing the children's program with the teacher, nurse, counsellor, etc." (60.8%).

A complete ranking of all 50 tasks according to percentage of parents involved is to be found in Appendix D.

4. The tasks that yielded the lowest percentage of parents involved were:

    "Organizing the duty roster" (4.6%),

    "Supervising crosswalks" (6.2%),

    "Assisting in music activities" (8.2%),

    "Doing clerical work" (8.2%).

Interview Schedule Item 9 yielded the following information:

1. When asked to name the 3 tasks in which they were most involved during the past 6 months over 90% mentioned "assisting in the classroom." In addition over 60% stated involvement with fieldtrips and one-half mentioned meetings as tasks in which they are presently involved.

How do parents prefer to be involved in the program?

The checklist-questionnaire yielded the following information:

1. For 32 of the 50 tasks in the checklist the majority of respondents desire involvement.
2. When analyzed in the categories, it was found that for four of the five categories: service, instructional support, decision-making and parent growth and development the majority of parents desire involvement. For the other category, administrative, it was found that the majority do not desire involvement.
3. The task "collecting 'junk' for classroom use" yielded the largest percentage for desired involvement (84.0%). The task "Observing children in a classroom" yielded the second largest percentage (81.4%). The tasks that yielded

the next largest percentages of parents desiring involvement were:

"Assisting in the supervision of fieldtrips" (79.4%).

"Reading articles or books on child development (78.9%).

"Discussing the children's program with the teacher, nurse, counsellor, etc." (78.3%).

A ranking of all 50 tasks according to percentage of parents desiring involvement is to be found in Appendix E.

4. The tasks that yielded the lowest percentage of parents desiring involvement were:

"Organizing the duty roster" (27.9%).

"Supervising crosswalks" (33.0%).

"Securing cost estimates for supplies and equipment for the children's program (33.5%).

"Preparing the program budget" (33.5%).

"Supervising bathroom breaks" (33.5%).

Interview Schedule Item 10 yielded the following information:

1. Over 85% of the subjects were satisfied with their present involvement.

What are the parents' perceptions of the L.A.C.?

Interview Schedule Item 11 yielded the following information:

1. Over one third of the subjects had no knowledge of the function of the L.A.C..
2. Slightly over one-half of the subjects were of the opinion that the L.A.C. was a useful committee because

according to E.C.S. guidelines a committee must be established before government funding is to be granted. Over one-third of the respondents were uncertain as to the usefulness of the L.A.C. because they had no knowledge of the function of this committee.

3. Over one-half of the subjects were of the opinion that the L.A.C. was an effective committee because they were successful in their attempt to obtain government funding for the program. Over one-third of the respondents were uncertain as to the success of the committee because they had no knowledge of the function of this committee.
4. Most of the respondents were uncertain as to the extent of authority of the L.A.C..
5. Most subjects were of the opinion that parents compose the majority of the L.A.C..
6. Over 40% of the subjects were of the opinion that L.A.C. members were selected by parents volunteering. Thirty-eight per cent did not know how the L.A.C. members were chosen.

How can parental involvement be improved?

Interview Schedule Item 12 yielded the following information:

1. Over one-third of the subjects did not know how parental involvement could be improved.
2. Over one-quarter of the subjects felt parent involvement could be improved through greater acceptance of parents by teachers and administrators.

3. The remaining subjects suggested numerous ways in which parent involvement could be improved.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This investigation has but touched the surface of an issue which is most relevant to educators in Alberta and elsewhere. The scope for continued research into parental involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs is unlimited. On the basis of the experience gained while conducting this project, the following are some recommended future courses of action.

Research could be designed to extend the breadth of this investigation. For example, the study could be replicated in other urban school districts, in rural areas and in privately operated E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs. Such studies would make it possible to compare parental opinions regarding their involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs in different school jurisdictions.

A logical extension of this study is the replication of the study using a random sample of respondents from a more general population such as parents of children enrolled in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs throughout the entire province. An approach such as this would make possible the generalization of findings to the level of the province at large.

The majority of parents who co-operated in this study are presently not involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. However, the majority desire involvement. A study of parents' opinions regarding their involvement in the program might be considered after two or three years to see if parents opinions regarding present and desired involvement have changed.

An examination of the relationships among the various categories of present and desired involvement and the relationship between parents' definition of parental involvement and their actual involvement would prove useful for increasing our understanding of parent involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs. Such studies may even uncover other dimensions of involvement, and relationships among these dimensions, which were not uncovered by the present investigation.

An interesting variable which may affect parent involvement and which could be examined in some future study is group pressure on the individual. A study of this variable would most certainly be interesting and theoretically productive.

A study of the involvement of parents in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs might be expanded to include the attitudes of teachers and administrators.

Studies could also be designed to extend the depth of the present investigation and to examine problems only alluded to in this exploratory project.

IV. IMPLICATIONS

The present relationship between teacher and parents that exists in the typical E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program requires that a teacher be able to work effectively with parents as well as with children. However, the typical 'kindergarten' teacher has received little or no training in working with parents. Presently there is a great demand for teachers to interact and co-operate with parents, community agencies and professionals in various fields. There is an urgent need that in the preparation of teachers for meaningful interaction with and utilization of parents in various roles as volunteers, decision-makers and partners in the education and development of children much greater consideration be given to parental involvement and its implication for teachers particularly at the 'kindergarten' level. Furthermore, consideration must be given to the preparation of administrators for effective management and implementation of parent involvement programs.

An implication of importance lies in the variance of parental opinion regarding their present and desired involvement in E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs. It is evident from this study that there are individual differences among parents with regard to these matters. It is no less evident that there are differences among schools. What may be appropriate for one school may be entirely inappropriate for another. And further research might well show that there are distinct differences between private and school board operated 'kindergartens,' between 'kindergartens' in urban and rural settings. E.C.S. should give much consideration to the possibility of differentiating between schools as to the category and degree of parental involvement.

Perhaps the greatest implication of this study is the indication of a need to identify and examine parent involvement activities and accomplishments in a much more comprehensive manner. What do parents actually want? Should they be permitted, encouraged or dissuaded, with respect to their aspirations? The determination of answers to these questions is of utmost importance for the demands of parents may be imminent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auerbach, A. B. *Parents learn through discussion*. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1968.

Becker, C. W. *Parents are teachers*. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, Co., 1971.

Best, J. B. *Research in education*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Beyer, E. *Sharing—a new level teacher-parent relationships*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1959.

Bingham, V., & Moore, B. *How to interview*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1959.

Bloom, B. *Stability and change in human characteristics*. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Borghi, L. *Perspectives in primary education*. The Hague, Netherlands: European Cultural Foundation, 1974.

Bourgeois, A. D. Community control and urban conflict. *Theory into Practice*, 1969, *8*, 233-236.

Butler, A. *Current research in early childhood education*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Education, 1970.

Butler, A. *Early childhood education: planning and administering programs*. Toronto, Ontario: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1974.

Bynner, J. M. *Parents' attitudes to education*. London: Her Majesty's Statonery Office, 1972.

Canadian Teachers Federation. *Parent involvement in school programs*. Ottawa, Ontario, 1971.

Conway, J., Jennings, R., & Milstein, M. *Understanding communities*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Cowen, N. The place of the parent. *Trends in Education*, 1966, *7*, 21-29.

Cox, J. V. The professional teacher. *Keeping Up with Elementary Education*, 1969, *3*, 9-12.

Croft, M. *Linking home and school*. London: Longman Group, Ltd., 1972.

Datta, L. E. Parent involvement in early childhood education. A perspective from the United States. National Institute of Education, 1973.

Dawes, R. M. Fundamentals of attitude measurement. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1972.

Downey, L. W. Research Associates. Opportunities for infants: Toward a policy on early childhood development. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1971.

Fantini, M. D. Public schools of choice. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1973.

Festinger, L., & Katz, D. Research methods in the behavioral sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1953.

Fox, D. J. The research process in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1969.

Fusco, G. C. The inner-city classroom: teacher behaviors. In R. Stron (Ed.), Reaching the parents. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1966.

Gardner, B. Development in early childhood. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Good, C. Essentials of educational research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972.

Good, C., & Scates, D. Methods of research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Goodacre, E. School and home. London, England: National Foundation for Educational Research, 1970.

Gordon, I. J. Early stimulation through parent education. Progress report. Institute for Development of Human Resources, University of Florida, 1968.

Gordon, I. J. Parent involvement in compensatory education. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1968.

Gordon, I. J. Reaching the young child through parent education. Childhood Education, 1968, 46, 247-249.

Gordon, I. J. Parents as educators. Childhood Education, 1970, 66, 441-443.

Government of Alberta. Operational plans for early childhood services. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1973.

Government of Alberta. Progress report to June, 1974. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1975.

Green, L. J. Parents and teachers: Partners or rivals? London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1968.

Greenwood, G., Brievogel, W., & Bissent, H. Some promising approaches to parent involvement. Theory into Practice, 1972, 11, 183-189.

Gronlund, N. E. Measurement and evaluation in teaching. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1965.

Hedges, H. G. Extending volunteer programs in schools. St. Catharines, Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1973.

Heffernan, H., & Todd, E. Elementary teacher's guide to working with parents. New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1969.

Hess, R. D. Educability and rehabilitation: the future of the welfare class. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1964, 26, 213-215.

Hess, R. D. Parental behavior and children's school achievement; implications for Head Start. In E. Grotberg (Ed.), Critical issues in research related to disadvantaged children. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Hess, R. D., Block, M., Costello, D., Knowles, E. J., & Largen, D. Parent involvement in early education. In E. Grotberg (Ed.), Day care: resources for decisions. Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1971.

Hoke, G. M. Parental opinions of I.P.I. arithmetic. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

Human Resources Research Council. Annual Report, 1971. Edmonton: Alberta Government Publication, 1971.

Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., & Cook, S. W. Research methods in social relations: Part I, Basic processes. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.

Kahn, R. L., & Cannell, D. F. The dynamics of interviewing. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1957.

Katz, D. The functional approach to the study of attitudes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, 163-204.

Kelly, E. J. Parental roles in special educational programming. A brief for involvement. The Journal of Special Education, 1973, 7, 8-10.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

Kittrell, F. P. Enriching the preschool experience of children from age 3. Children, 1968, 15, 135-139.

Klaus, R., & Gray, S. The early training project for disadvantaged children: a report after five years. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College Press, 1967.

Knitzer, J. Parental involvement: the elixir of changes in early childhood development programs and services. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1973.

Koerner, J. D. Who controls American education? A guide for the laymen. Boston: Beacon Press, 1961.

Lewis, A. C. Conference time for teachers and parents. Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1970.

Liddle, G., & Rockwell, R. The disadvantaged learner: knowing, understanding, educating. In S. Webster (Ed.), The role of parents and family life. San Francisco: Chandler, 1966.

Lombard, E. C. Essentials in home and school. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1937, 3, 5-6.

Maccoby, E., & Zellner, M. Experiments in primary education: aspects of Project Follow Through. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovic, Inc., 1970.

Margolin, E. Sociocultural elements in early childhood education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc., 1974.

McDavid, J. W. Project Head Start: evaluation and research, 1965-67. Mimeograph Report. Washington, D.C.: Division of Research and Evaluation, 4, 1968.

McGeeney, P. Parents are welcome. London: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., 1969.

Moynihan, D. The Negro family: the case for national action. Washington, D.C.: Office of Policy Planning and Research, U. S. Department of Labor, 1965.

Murphy, G., Murphy, L. B., & Newcomb, T. M. Experimental social psychology. New York: Harper & Bros., 1931.

Newman, S. Guidelines to parent-teacher co-operation in early childhood education. New York: Book-Lab, Inc., 1971.

Office of Economic Opportunity. Parent and child centers: a guide for the development of Parent and Child Centers. Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1967.

Office of Economic Opportunity. Project Follow Through. Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1967.

Office of Economic Opportunity. Project Head Start: points for parents. Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1967.

Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire design and attitude measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Parten, M. Surveys, polls and samples. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.

Pavenstedt, E. A. A comparison of the child-rearing environment of upper-lower and very low-lower class families. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1965, 35, 89-98.

Payne, J. S., Mercer, D., Payne, R. A., & Davison, R. G. Head Start: a tragicomedy with epilogue. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1973.

Pickarts, E., & Fargo, J. Parent education: toward parental competence. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.

Plowden, L. Children and their primary schools: a report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England). London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967.

Pomfret, A. Involving parents in schools: toward developing a social intervention technology. Interchange, 1973, 3, 114-130.

Radin, N., & Sonquist, H. The Gale school program: final report. Ypsilanti Public Schools, 1968, 12, 15.

Rahmlow, H. F., & Kiehn, S. O. Survey analysis of major tasks: knowledge associated with work in child care occupations. Project for the U. S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Department of HEW, 1967b.

Remmers, H. H., & Gage, N. L. Educational measurement and evaluation. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1960.

Sanford, N. The interview in personality appraisal. In T. A. Anastasi (Ed.), Testing problems in perspective. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

Sayler, M. L. Parents: active partners in education. Washington, D.C.: Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery-Educators, 1971.

Sharrock, A. Aspects of communication between schools and parents. Education Research, 1970, 10, 3-10.

Sharrock, A. Home/school relations. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1970.

Shipman, M. D. Childhood: a sociological perspective. London: John Gardner, Ltd., 1972.

Siber, S., & Wilder, D. The school in society. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Smith, M. B. We must involve parents. Instructor Magazine, 1970, 80, 119-121.

Spodek, B. Teaching in the early years. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Spodek, B. Early childhood education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Survey Research Center. Interviewer's manual. Ann Arbour, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1969.

Taylor, K. W. Parents and children learn together. New York: Teachers College Press, 1967.

Taylor, W. Family, school and society. In M. Croft (Ed.), Linking home and school. London: Longman Group Ltd., 1972.

Thurlow, A. Parent-teacher communication. Young Children, 1972, 28, 87-89.

Thurstone, L. L. Attitudes can be measured. In G. F. Summes (Ed.), Attitude measurement. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1956.

Thurstone, L. L., & Chave, E. J. The measurement of attitude. A psychological method of some experiments with a scale for measuring attitudes towards the church. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Weber, E. Early childhood education: perspective on change. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1970.

Webster's third new international dictionary of the English language. Unabridged. Springfield, Mass.: B. & C. Merriam, 1971.

Weikart, D., Levenstein, P., & Gray, S. Symposium on parent-centered education. Childhood Education, 1971, 63, 1-12.

Wilcox, P. Parental decision-making: an educational necessity. Theory into Practice, 1973, 2, 183-189.

Wolman, T., & Levenson, D. Parent-school partnership in pre-kindergarten. Teachers College Record, 1968, 69, 422.

Worth, W. H. A choice of futures. Report of the Commission on Educational Planning. Edmonton, Alberta: Queen's Printer, 1972.

Wrightstone, J. W., Justman, J., & Robbins, I. Evaluation in modern education. New York: American Book Company, 1956.

Zigler, E. F. Project Head Start: success or failure. Children Today, 2, 62-64.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CHECKLIST-QUESTIONNAIRE

15212 - 74 Street,
Edmonton, Alberta,
March 10, 1975.

Dear Parent(s):

Please find attached a checklist-questionnaire regarding parental involvement in the Early Childhood Services (E.C.S.) 'kindergarten' program. This checklist-questionnaire, with your assistance, will identify how parents are involved and how parents desire to be involved in the program.

NO attempt is made to evaluate any parent and the study is NOT connected with the local school, the school board or any government agency. Your name will NOT be used in any reporting of the results of this survey.

The results of this survey will be used in the writer's thesis in fulfilling requirements for a Master of Education degree from the University of Alberta.

Please complete the checklist-questionnaire according to your involvement in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. DO NOT put your name on the checklist. When you have completed the checklist-questionnaire please return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope that is provided.

Please return it as soon as possible. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dania P. Vogel

Dania P. Vogel

DPV/rv

DIRECTIONS:

The tasks below indicate some of the ways that parents can be involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. Please answer each task in the checklist by:

(a) checking (✓) one of the three boxes under the words PRESENT INVOLVEMENT to indicate how you ARE INVOLVED in the task area mentioned

AND

(b) checking (✓) one of the three boxes under the words DESIRED INVOLVEMENT to indicate how you would PREFER to be INVOLVED in the task area.

	PRESENT INVOLVEMENT			DESIRED INVOLVEMENT		
	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
1. Completing the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' application forms.						
2. Supervising bathroom breaks.						
3. Selecting program personnel, e.g., teachers, teacher-aides.						
4. Collecting 'junk' for classroom use, e.g., egg cartons, buttons.						
5. Supervising small group activities.						
6. Responding to children's questions in the classroom.						
7. Leading small group discussions with children.						

	PRESENT INVOLVEMENT			DESIRED INVOLVEMENT		
	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
8. Supervising snacks (juice and cookies).						
9. Doing clerical work, e.g., typing, duplicating materials.						
10. Interviewing program personnel, e.g., teachers, teacher-aides.						
11. Preparing art and craft materials.						
12. Sewing, e.g., costumes, curtains, puppets.						
13. Participating in study-group sessions on child development, nutrition, language development, etc.						
14. Laminating parent and teacher made materials.						
15. Choosing materials for the children's program.						
16. Working in an activity center with small groups of children.						
17. Serving on the Local Advisory Committee (L.A.C.).						

	PRESENT INVOLVEMENT			DESIRED INVOLVEMENT		
	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
18. Talking to children about your work, hobbies, etc.						
19. Supervising crosswalks.						
20. Purchasing equipment for the children's program as ordered by the teacher.						
21. Reading articles or books on child development.						
22. Assessing program needs.						
23. Helping to arrange and set out equipment and materials.						
24. Explaining to children reasons for observing class rules.						
25. Choosing equipment for the children's program.						
26. Preparing a newsletter to keep parents informed.						
27. Planning and organizing fieldtrips.						
28. Reading and/or telling stories to children.						

	PRESENT INVOLVEMENT			DESIRED INVOLVEMENT		
	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
29. Assisting with outdoor play activities.						
30. Organizing fund raising events, e.g., raffles, tea and bake sales.						
31. Setting program goals and objectives.						
32. Observing children in a 'kindergarten' classroom.						
33. Serving on a telephone committee.						
34. Constructing tables, blocks, animal cages, etc., for classroom use.						
35. Planning the children's program.						
36. Preparing the program budget.						
37. Assisting in music activities.						
38. Evaluating the objectives and goals of the children's program.						
39. Preparing snacks (juice and cookies).						

	PRESENT INVOLVEMENT			DESIRED INVOLVEMENT		
	Much	Some	None	Much	Some	None
40. Securing cost estimates for supplies and equipment for the children's program.						
41. Assisting in the supervision of field-trips.						
42. Organizing the duty roster.						
43. Viewing films, slides, etc., in the parent program.						
44. Participating in workshops and leadership training sessions.						
45. Discussing the children's program with the teacher, nurse, counsellor, etc.						
46. Preparing materials for the children's program, e.g., charts, puzzles, games.						
47. Organizing a parent study group.						
48. Helping children dress and undress (clothing, footwear) in the classroom.						

APPENDIX B

GUIDE TO THE SCHEDULE AND INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

SCHEDULE GUIDE

Hello, my name is Dania Vogel. I telephoned you earlier and we arranged to meet at this time for an interview. May I come in? Here is my letter of introduction.

(Begin a conversation about the weather, etc., to establish some initial rapport with the respondent while the materials are being unpacked. Place cassette tape recorder on the floor. Wait until subject is seated. Distance is important. The greater the distance the more detached and formal the interview becomes.)

Before I begin asking my questions I'd like to tell you something about what I'm doing. I am conducting a study to determine how parents feel about their involvement in funded E.C.S. 'kindergarten' programs. It is felt that the opinions of parents who have children in this program are a very important part of the study. It is impossible to get the opinions of all parents so you are one of the few parents selected for an interview. The opinions I obtain from all the parents I interview will be used in my thesis.

I'd like to record our interview on this little tape recorder. The reasons for using this is because it would be impossible for me to write down everything you say. As a matter of fact, interviewers who have attempted to do this have found that they can only write down about one third of everything that is said.

After the interview I'll use the tape to type out what you said and then I can erase and re-use the tape for other interviews.

During the interview I'll be reading questions. As you are answering these questions I may be writing shorthand comments about your reactions, or things which will not show up on the tape. For example you may give an opinion and say it with a smile. On the tape it may sound like you said it with a frown. It is important that this be noted so that the real reason behind your comments is clear. Part of the way we talk is with facial expressions.

For this reason I will be unemotional to any opinion that you express. If I smiled or frowned I may cause you to change your words. I wouldn't want to do that because anything you say is not out of place and I won't appear shocked or pleased at your opinion. All I ask is that you say what you believe. As I've said before your opinions will not be made public. What is said here is between you and me.

I'm sure you have other questions about the study. I'll be pleased to tell you more about it more fully after the interview.

(May be some need for light conversation at this point to make sure the respondent feels at ease. The tape recorder can be started during this light conversation.)

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Item 1: Would you like to make any comments concerning the checklist-questionnaire?

Probe: Was there anything about it that you were not able to understand?

Probe: Was it too long? Too short? Were there any tasks omitted?

Item 2: Your child attends an E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program? What can you tell me about this program?

Probe: Are you pleased that your child is in this program?

IF ANSWER YES:

Probe: What things about the program make you pleased that your child is in it?

IF ANSWER NO:

Probe: Why do you say that? (Probe for reasons.)

Item 3: The E.C.S. philosophy is that parents should be involved in the 'kindergarten' program. What do you understand parental involvement to mean?

Probe: Does parental involvement mean anything else to you?

Probe: How would you define parent involvement?

Item 4: What do you like most about parental involvement?

Probe: What else do you like about parental involvement?

Probe: Has parental involvement been of any benefit to your child? (Explain your answer.)

Item 5: What do you like least about parental involvement? (Explain your answer.)

Probe: Is there anything else that you don't like about parental involvement?

Item 6: Some people feel that all parents should be involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program. Other people feel that only those who want to be involved should be. How do you personally feel about this?

Probe: What about parents who do not have the time to be involved?

Probe: What if both parents work outside the home?

Probe: What about single parent families?

Item 7: What is your opinion about the involvement of fathers in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program?

Probe: Should fathers be involved? (Explain your answers.)

Probe: Are fathers involved in the program your child attends? To what extent?

Probe: Are any fathers on the Local Advisory Committee (L.A.C.)?

Probe: In what ways might fathers become more involved in the program?

Item 8: Parents must be involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program before government funding is granted. How do you feel about this?

Probe: Should government have the right to legislate parental involvement? (Explain your answer.)

Item 9: Have you been involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program during the past six months?

IF ANSWER YES:

Probe: In what ways were you involved?

Probe: Please name the three tasks in which you were most involved?

IF ANSWER NO:

Probe: Do you mind telling me why you were not involved? (Probe for reasons.)

Item 10: Would you have preferred to be involved in the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program during the past six months in a different way than you were?

IF ANSWER YES:

Probe: Please tell me some of these ways.

Probe: Name the three tasks in which you would have preferred to be involved.

IF ANSWER NO:

Probe: Why do you say that? (Probe for reasons.)

Item 11: Some parents are involved on the Local Advisory Committee (L.A.C.). Are you familiar with the L.A.C.?

IF ANSWER YES:

Probe: Please describe briefly the work of this committee?

Probe: In your opinion is it a useful committee? (Explain your answer.)

Probe: In your opinion is it a successful committee? (Explain your answer.)

Probe: What is the extent of the committee's authority? Advisory? Decision-making?

Probe: How many parents are on the L.A.C.? How many of these are parents? Who else?

Probe: How were these people selected?

Item 12: In what ways do you feel that the E.C.S. 'kindergarten' program that your child attends could be most improved, particularly in the area of parental involvement.

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
10010 - 107A Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta T5H 0Z8, Telephone (403) 429-5621

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Mr. James F. Falconer
Chairman

Mr. Mel Binder

Mrs. Shirley Forbes

Mrs. Catherine Ford

Mr. R. Herbert Jamieson

Mr. R. Vernon Johnson

Mr. E. Lund

ADMINISTRATION

Mr. M. A. Strembitsky
Superintendent
Secretary-Treasurer

Mr. E. W. Meen
Deputy Superintendent

Mr. C. Daneliuk
Associate Superintendent
Curriculum

Mr. G. P. Nicholson
Associate Superintendent
School Resources

Mr. R. A. Jones
Deputy Secretary

Mr. G. T. Dodds
Deputy Treasurer

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION FOR

DANIA VOGEL

Mrs. Dania Vogel, a teacher with the Edmonton Public School Board on leave of absence in graduate studies for the 1974-75 school year has been granted permission to conduct research in Early Childhood Studies in the area of parental involvement in the Kindergarten Program.

One important aspect of the research is the interview with the parents whose children are presently attending an Early Childhood Services "Kindergarten" Program. The purpose of the interview is to get first hand opinions from parents with regard to parental involvement in the Early Childhood Services "Kindergarten" programs.

Kay Chernowski

Kay Chernowski (Mrs)
Supervisor,
Early Childhood Education.

KMC/JHH

EDMONTON — HOME OF THE 1978 COMMONWEALTH GAMES

APPENDIX D

RANKING OF TASKS FOR PRESENT INVOLVEMENT

RANKING OF TASKS ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGE OF ALL RESPONDENTS PRESENTLY INVOLVED

Task	Task Description	Category	Percentage Involvement	Rank
4	Collecting 'junk.'	Service	87.7	1
21	Reading articles/books.	Parent Growth	69.6	2
32	Observing children.	Parent Growth	68.0	3
41	Assisting on fieldtrips.	Instr. Support	64.4	4
45	Discussing child's prgm.	Parent Growth	60.8	5
39	Preparing snacks.	Service	52.0	6
5	Supervising small grps.	Instr. Support	50.5	7
8	Supervising snacks.	Instr. Support	44.3	8
11	Preparing art and craft.	Service	42.2	9
24	Explaining class rules.	Instr. Support	40.6	10
48	Helping children dress.	Service	40.3	11
50	Tidying the classroom.	Service	40.2	12
23	Arranging materials.	Service	38.2	13
6	Responding to questions.	Instr. Support	38.1	14
46	Preparing materials.	Service	36.1	15
13	Participating in study groups.	Parent Growth	34.6	16
28	Reading stories.	Instr. Support	31.9	17
22	Assessing prgm. needs.	Decision-making	30.9	18
1	Completing forms.	Administrative	30.4	19
27	Planning fieldtrips.	Decision-making	29.9	20
16	Working in act. center.	Instr. Support	29.4	21
33	Telephone committee.	Service	25.2	22
12	Sewing.	Service	23.7	23
18	Talking to children.	Instr. Support	23.7	23
29	Assisting with outdoor activities.	Instr. Support	23.7	23

RANKING OF TASKS ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGE OF ALL RESPONDENTS PRESENTLY INVOLVED (Continued)

Task	Task Description	Category	Percentage Involvement	Rank
3	Selecting personnel.	Decision-making	22.7	26
17	Serving on L.A.C.	Administrative	22.2	27
15	Choosing materials.	Decision-making	22.1	28
38	Evaluating goals.	Decision-making	22.1	28
20	Purchasing equipment.	Administrative	19.0	30
44	Participating in workshops.	Parent Growth	18.5	31
14	Laminating materials.	Service	18.0	32
7	Leading grp. discussions.	Instr. Support	17.5	33
25	Choosing equipment	Decision-making	17.0	34
31	Setting prgrm. goals.	Decision-making	16.0	35
2	Supervising bathroom.	Service	15.4	36
36	Preparing prgrm. budget.	Decision-making	13.9	37
35	Planning program.	Decision-making	12.4	38
49	Purchasing materials.	Administrative	12.3	39
43	Viewing films, slides.	Parent Growth	11.3	40
26	Preparing newsletters.	Administrative	10.8	41
34	Constructing tables.	Service	10.8	41
30	Organizing fund events.	Administrative	8.8	43
40	Securing cost estimates.	Administrative	8.7	44
47	Organizing study-groups.	Administrative	8.7	44
9	Doing clerical work.	Service	8.2	46
37	Assisting in musical act.	Instr. Support	8.2	46
10	Interviewing prgrm. personnel.	Administrative	6.2	48
19	Supervising crosswalks.	Service	6.2	48
42	Organizing duty roster.	Administrative	4.6	50

APPENDIX E

RANKING OF TASKS FOR DESIRED INVOLVEMENT

RANKING OF TASKS ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGE OF ALL RESPONDENTS DESIRING INVOLVEMENT

Task	Task Description	Category	Percentage Involvement	Rank
4	Collecting 'junk.'	Service	84.0	1
32	Observing children.	Parent Growth	81.4	2
41	Assisting on fieldtrips.	Instr. Support	79.4	3
21	Reading articles/books.	Parent Growth	78.9	4
45	Discussing child's prgm.	Parent Growth	78.3	5
5	Supervising small grps.	Instr. Support	72.2	6
16	Working in act. center.	Instr. Support	66.0	7
13	Participating in study groups.	Parent Growth	64.9	8
29	Assisting with outdoor activities.	Instr. Support	64.4	9
28	Reading stories.	Instr. Support	63.9	10
27	Planning fieldtrips.	Decision-making	63.4	11
39	Preparing snacks.	Service	63.4	11
11	Preparing art and craft.	Service	62.9	13
22	Assessing prgm. needs.	Decision-making	62.3	14
46	Preparing materials.	Service	61.8	15
6	Responding to questions.	Instr. Support	61.3	16
18	Talking to children.	Instr. Support	60.8	17
24	Explaining class rules.	Instr. Support	60.8	17
23	Arranging materials	Service	60.3	19
12	Sewing.	Service	58.7	20
48	Helping children dress.	Service	58.7	20
8	Supervising snacks.	Instr. Support	58.3	22
50	Tidying the classroom.	Service	57.2	23
38	Evaluating goals.	Decision-making	56.7	24
7	Leading grp. discussions.	Instr. Support	55.6	25

RANKING OF TASKS ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGE OF ALL RESPONDENTS DESIRING INVOLVEMENT (Continued)

Task	Task Description	Category	Percentage Involvement	Rank
1	Completing forms.	Administrative	55.1	26
15	Choosing materials.	Decision-making	54.1	27
33	Telephone committee.	Service	51.5	28
3	Selecting personnel.	Decision-making	51.1	29
44	Participating in workshops.	Parent Growth	51.0	30
43	Viewing films, slides.	Parent Growth	50.5	31
31	Setting program goals.	Decision-making	50.0	32
25	Choosing equipment.	Decision-making	49.0	33
14	Laminating materials.	Service	46.4	34
20	Purchasing equipment.	Administrative	45.8	35
35	Planning programs.	Decision-making	45.4	36
34	Constructing tables.	Service	41.3	37
47	Organizing study-groups.	Administrative	41.2	38
30	Organizing fund events.	Administrative	39.7	39
9	Doing clerical work.	Service	39.2	40
17	Serving on L.A.C.	Administrative	39.1	41
49	Purchasing materials.	Administrative	38.7	42
26	Preparing newsletters.	Administrative	37.6	43
37	Assisting in music act.	Instr. Support	37.6	43
10	Interviewing program personnel.	Administrative	34.5	45
2	Supervising bathrooms.	Service	33.5	46
36	Preparing program budget.	Decision-making	33.5	46
40	Securing cost estimates.	Administrative	33.5	46
19	Supervising crosswalks.	Service	33.0	49
42	Organizing duty roster.	Administrative	27.9	50

END

27 10 76

FIN

ARC - 275